HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XLIII OCTOBER, 1950 NUMBER 4

SOME ASPECTS OF THE UPPSALA SCHOOL OF OLD TESTAMENT STUDY[1]

G. W. ANDERSON
HANDSWORTH COLLEGE
BIRMINGHAM, ENGLAND

THE TITLE of this paper calls for qualification and explanation. A distinguished Swedish theologian once remarked that the rise of a school in any department of theological study can be inimical to the best interests of scholarship, since the members of a school tend to be concerned rather with the defence of positions already assumed than with impartial inquiry into truth. Diversity of opinion on certain problems among the Uppsala group of Old Testament scholars would in itself acquit them of this charge; and it may therefore be questioned whether the term 'school' can be accurately applied to them. If we do so use it, we must take it to indicate a common approach to Old Testament problems rather than detailed agreement in the solution of these problems. Again, the use of the term 'Uppsala' is open to criticism. The common approach just mentioned confessedly owes much to work done outside Scandinavia and in other parts of Scandinavia. Neither form criticism nor tradition history originated in Sweden; and the importance of the cult in Old Testament religion and of the place of the king in the cult was first maintained elsewhere than in Uppsala. But, for convenience, the term 'Uppsala School' may be retained to describe a group of scholars, connected, for the most part, with the older Swedish University, in whose work there is a common emphasis, a common approach, and a common *type* of solution, even where there is controversy over detail. In the fields of textual and literary criticism[2] great emphasis is laid on the importance

[1] A paper read at the Silver Jubilee Summer Meeting of the British Society for Old Testament Study held at Bangor, N. Wales, July 19–21, 1949.

[2] The term is used for want of a better, though Professor Engnell and other members of the school tend to use it as a term of abuse to describe views of which they disapprove.

and reliability of oral tradition. In the study of religion the school is anti-evolutionist, and is concerned to stress the abiding positive influence of the cult, and the importance of the rôle of both king and prophet in the cult. These lines converge in a vigorous attack on the analysis of the literature and the reconstruction of the history of the religion which are associated with the name of Wellhausen.

A considerable amount of the work done by the Uppsala circle is available in English, German, or French, chiefly in the form of monographs. The purpose of this paper is not to discuss the special problems treated in these studies, but to present some aspects of the general position of the school, dealing particularly with the literature which has appeared in the Scandinavian languages. So far as I am aware, only two statements of this position have been published, the first being part I of Professor Engnell's introduction to the Old Testament,[3] and the second the more summary account given in the articles on the Old Testament and the religion of the Old Testament contributed by the same scholar to the new Swedish Bible Dictionary.[4] It is unfortunate that the second part of the former work has not yet appeared; for there is promised in it a detailed vindication of the author's views; and, whether we like these views or not, we must probably suspend final judgment on them until that vindication is made available. What follows is a survey of Engnell's main contentions, with some reference to earlier Scandinavian work on similar lines and also to the subsequent debate.

I. Oral Tradition and Literary Criticism

When *Gattungsforschung* was first applied to the Old Testament, it was felt that this was a new step to be taken now that so much of the work of documentary analysis had been accomplished. Dependent as Engnell is on the methods of form criticism, he proceeds on the view that a large part of the work of documentary analysis, and of literary criticism generally, must be undone, because it has been carried out in complete disregard of the impor-

[3] I. Engnell, Gamla Testamentet. En traditionshistorisk inledning, I, Uppsala and Stockholm, 1945.

[4] I. Engnell and A. Fridrichsen, Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk, I (A-K), Gävle, 1948.

tance of a reliable oral tradition in the formation of the Old Testament, as of other oriental literatures. For the genesis of this view, so far as the Uppsala school is concerned, we must go back to the introduction to Nyberg's textual study of Hosea,[5] in which, while dealing trenchantly with the problems of textual criticism, the author raises, by implication, important questions for source criticism. Nyberg there maintains that the Hebrew text of the Old Testament is dependent on an oral tradition which was thoroughly trustworthy, and which was the chief means of the preservation of saga, legend, law, and prophecy in the period before the Exile. He says, 'Das schriftliche AT ist eine Schöpfung der jüdischen Gemeinde nach dem Exil; was dem vorausging, war sicher nur zum kleineren Teil schriftlich fixiert.'[6] Transmission was not mechanical repetition; but the material was adapted and expanded through succeeding generations. Thus, speaking broadly, in place of the fumbling officiousness of the interpolator Nyberg presupposes the organic growth of a living tradition. Because he does presuppose this development, he has to warn us that we can never be sure of getting back to the *ipsissima verba* of the great personalities of the Old Testament. We must content ourselves with accepting the tradition about what they said.[7]

The view thus stated summarily and without detailed defence by Nyberg was given fuller exposition and application by the Norwegian scholar, H. Birkeland, in a short monograph on the composition of the prophetical books.[8] Following Nyberg, he supported his general contentions by reference to the position of the Qur'an in Islam, the Book of books, yet known and quoted by heart. Even where sacred truth is enshrined in canonical scripture, oral tradition continues (an argument which, we may note in passing, cuts both ways, since the existence of a vigorous oral tradition does not necessarily preclude, but may presuppose, the existence of a written text). Birkeland also refers, as Nyberg had not done, to the oral transmission in Islam of traditions which received fixed forms, and to the alleged oral transmission of Arabic poetry

[5] H. S. Nyberg, Studien zum Hoseabuche, Uppsala, 1935. Cf. his article in ZAW, lii. (1934), pp. 241–254.

[6] Op. cit., p. 8.

[7] Op. cit., p. 9.

[8] H. Birkeland, Zum hebräischen Traditionswesen, Oslo, 1938.

before the time of the Umayyads. A similar process of oral tradition, he contends, preserved the material contained in our prophetical books, and arranged it in complexes, so that all that remained to be done when the material was committed to writing was the arranging of the complexes in order.[9] The second part of Birkeland's book contains an analysis of the prophetical books on these lines, assuming the formation and expansion of complexes of material in the circles of prophetic disciples who preserved the tradition of their masters' teaching.

If Birkeland's chief debt was to Nyberg, he was also influenced by Mowinckel, to whose contributions to the debate we may now turn. Nearly a quarter of a century ago he published (in Norwegian) a study of prophecy in the period between Isaiah and Jeremiah.[10] In it he argues that the post-Isaianic but pre-exilic portions of Isaiah, the greater part of Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, 'The Song of Moses,' and to some extent the Deuteronomic laws, are the result of the activity of the prophetic community created by Isaiah's ministry. In his analysis of these books Mowinckel employs the methods of literary criticism which Engnell attacks as outmoded; but the book is important, not only as a penetrating study of the development of religious thought in the seventh century, but for its suggestive account of the creative activity of the prophetic community associated with Isaiah. Amos and Hosea (says Mowinckel) were both men of the spoken word; and it was probably through the influence of Isaiah's circle that the words of these two prophets, which had previously been orally preserved, came to be written down.[11]

Mention may be made of three more recent contributions which Mowinckel has made to the subject: (i) an important article on the origin of the prophetic literature;[12] (ii) part of the brilliant introduction to the third volume of the new Norwegian translation of and commentary on the Old Testament;[13] (iii) his important

[9] Op. cit., p. 30.

[10] S. Mowinckel, Jesaja-disiplene, Oslo, 1926.

[11] Op. cit., p. 128.

[12] 'Oppkomsten av profetlitteraturen,' Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift, 1942, pp. 65–111.

[13] S. Michelet, S. Mowinckel, N. Messel, Det Gamle Testamente, III, De senere profeter, Oslo, 1944, pp. 33 ff.

monograph on prophecy and tradition.[14] To the third of these we must return later. The first two make clear Mowinckel's general position. Of fundamental importance is the circle of prophetic disciples, gathered around the master to be initiated into the ecstatic experience and the technique of divination, and, at a later stage, those who were gripped by the spiritual content of the prophets' message. The preservation of the master's teaching was primarily oral; and, when the stimulus to write it down did come, it was not a desire to gain for it a wider public, but the occasional need to record that, in a specific situation, the master had said such and such.[15] But such written records of prophetic teaching were only fragmentary. The creation of a written prophetic literature is a late development, influenced by the increasing unfamiliarity of Hebrew as a spoken language.[16] Before that development took place, the oral transmission of prophetic teaching involved both selection and arrangement. It was not the entire message of a prophet that was preserved, but only what his circle and posterity had an interest in preserving. It was remembered because it met their need; it was adapted to meet their need; and to it there were added new prophetic sayings which originated in the prophetic community, and were therefore regarded as words of the master himself.

It was in the year after the publication of the third volume of the Norwegian commentary that the first part of Engnell's introduction appeared. The first two chapters deal briefly with the problems of canon and text, and include a forceful exposition of Nyberg's views on the latter. In the third chapter, which is concerned with literary forms, Engnell's dependence on earlier workers in this field is obvious.[17] But most significant is his emphasis on the importance of oral tradition. He maintains that, unless oral tradition had held the position which Nyberg, Birkeland and others assign to it, nothing in the realm of literature would have survived the Exile. We must think of the growth of the Old Testament books in a very different way from that to which an earlier

[14] S. Mowinckel, Prophecy and Tradition, Oslo, 1946.

[15] E.g. Is. viii. 1 f., 16; xxx. 8; Hab. ii. 2; Jer. xxxvi.

[16] Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift, 1942, p. 103.

[17] Cf. A. Bentzen, Introduction to the Old Testament, E.T., I, Copenhagen, 1948, p. 102.

generation was accustomed. Instead of the presumed scissors-and-paste methods of literary compilers, we are to think of circles or schools of tradition, in which the various types of material were preserved and transmitted orally: the wisdom literature by the scribes and the wise, the Psalms by priests and Temple-singers, the collections of laws by other priestly groups, the prophetic teaching by communities of disciples, the narrative traditions by a type corresponding to the Arabian *rawi*. Like Nyberg, Engnell asserts both the reliability and the creative power of the process of oral transmission, by which the material was preserved, arranged, and expanded into collections which had already received definite form before they were committed to writing. Beyond that fixed deposit of tradition we must not seek the prophets' own words.

Mowinckel's Prophecy and Tradition, published the following year, is in part an elaboration and defence of his own views, and in part a criticism of Engnell. Literary criticism, he maintains, cannot be dismissed out of hand as an antiquated and unreliable tool. In Jeremiah, for instance, the critic has to seek to define the extent of Baruch's roll, besides reckoning with the existence of material which was transmitted and transformed in Deuteronomic circles. Nor will Mowinckel accept the view that it is idle to attempt to recover the *ipsissima verba* of the prophets, or to distinguish between earlier and later strata in the tradition.

> In Engnell's terminology the term "Traditio-historical" seems to have lost much of its original relation to the history, i.e. the study and explanation of the origin, growth and development of the different traditions and the tradition mass; it refers above all to the mere stressing of the fact that the composition of the original units (separate traditions) and the compilation and elaboration of the present books have been the oral, not literary work of the transmitting circles.[18]

Thus the critic must reckon with a development of both oral and written tradition. A *fixed* oral tradition presupposes a fixed written text with canonical authority.[19] But before that fixation took place there was a development from the individual unit to the collection of sayings and narratives, and thence to the 'book' as we now have

[18] Prophecy and Tradition, p. 18; cf. pp. 36f., 86, 88.
[19] Op. cit., p. 26.

it. In the tracing of that development form criticism, tradition-history, and literary criticism (in the narrower sense) all have parts to play.

Engnell's rejoinder is to be found in his contribution to the Lindblom Festskrift,[20] in which he deals afresh with the whole question of prophecy and tradition. To Mowinckel's criticism that he thinks of almost the entire literature of the Old Testament as having been orally transmitted,[21] Engnell replies (a) that he had clearly stated that the different literary types were not all transmitted by the same process,[22] and (b) that in the prophetic literature in particular he distinguishes between two types. The first of these is the liturgy type, in which Engnell includes Joel, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Deutero-Isaiah, and which he thinks of as being primarily the creation of individual prophetic personalities, and as probably having been committed to writing from the beginning.[23] The second is the *diwan* type, 'the collected result of predominantly oral traditions of prophetic words and traditions about the prophet, handed down and disseminated within a circle of disciples and traditionists who hide themselves behind the authoritative name of the prophetic master.'[24] To this type Engnell assigns Amos, Hosea, the first part of Isaiah, and Jeremiah (he likens Baruch to the *mustamli* in Islam). Detailed evidence for this view will no doubt be forthcoming in the second part of Engnell's introduction. Meanwhile I can only say that I find it hard to agree on any ground whatsoever that Nahum or Habakkuk bears clearer marks of the work of a distinctive personality with a characteristic literary style and a distinctive religious message than the first part of Isaiah or than Jeremiah.

Engnell further asserts that in his view literary criticism and the study of oral tradition ought not to be played off against each other as mutually exclusive alternatives.[25] This statement is repeated in the article on the Old Testament in the new Swedish Bible Dic-

[20] 'Profetia och tradition' in Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok, XII, 1947, pp. 110–139.

[21] Prophecy and Tradition, p. 18.

[22] Gamla Testamentet, I, pp. 29, 40f.

[23] Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok, XII, pp. 128f.; cf. The Call of Isaiah, Uppsala and Leipzig, 1949, p. 60.

[24] Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok, XII, p. 129.

[25] Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok, XII, p. 127, n. 38.

tionary,[26] and in an additional note to his short study of the call of Isaiah.[27] His attitude to this matter may therefore be taken as established. But his attacks on what he calls literary criticism have been so frequent and so emphatic that it is not surprising if his position has been misunderstood; and it might have been well if he had distinguished between the method of literary criticism on the one hand, and, on the other, particular conclusions of which he disapproves.

Professor Geo Widengren (whose influence in the Uppsala School has been very considerable in another field) has recently published a study of the place of oral tradition in the prophetic literature, in which he re-examines some of the positions adopted by the scholars already mentioned, and, in particular, the parallels adduced from the literature of Islam and of pre-Islamic Arabia.[28] From what he himself modestly describes as an inadequate survey of the Arabic material, Widengren concludes that oral transmission was of far less importance than has been alleged, and that the mode of transmission depended on the general state of scribal culture in different districts and at different periods. The dictum of the poet Dū-l-Rummah (Umayyad period), 'A book does not forget or alter words or phrases which have taken the poet a long time to compose'[29] is hardly a testimony to the superior reliability of oral tradition. Widengren also draws attention to the significant fact 'that *on various occasions Muhammad would recite the same sūrah in a different wording, and that this variation was from the outset preserved in the different readings in which the sūrah circulated, both in oral and written tradition.*'[30] Further, a passage such as Sūrah lxxiv. 27–30, 31–34 seems to point to the existence of explanatory additions by the prophet himself.[31]

Turning to the Old Testament, Widengren first surveys the indications that written sources have been employed in the composi-

[26] Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk, I, col. 659.

[27] The Call of Isaiah, Uppsala and Leipzig, 1949.

[28] G. Widengren, Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets, Uppsala and Leipzig, 1948.

[29] Quoted op. cit. p. 24.

[30] Op. cit., p. 48. In support Widengren cites the tradition that when 'Umar and Hisham ibn al-Hakim were disputing which of them recited Sūrah 25 correctly the prophet told them that both versions were correct.

[31] Widengren also refers to liii. 23, 26–33; lxxxiii. 29–34; lxxxv. 8–11.

tion of the narrative books (e.g. references to 'The Book of the Wars of Yahweh,' Num. xxi. 14–17; 'The Book of Yashar,' Jos. x. 13; 'The Book of the Acts of Solomon,' I Kings xi. 41; 'The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah,' I Kings xiv. 29, etc.; 'The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel,' I Kings xv. 31, etc.), and then turns to the evidence in the canonical prophets that prophetic oracles sometimes were actually written down (Is. viii. 1, 16; xxx. 8; Jer. xxxvi. 2, 4, 32; li. 60; Ezek. ii. 9 f.; xliii. 11; Hab. ii. 2). Neither the evidence nor the deduction from it is novel; but, after the debate which we have surveyed, it is worth noting again that the Old Testament itself provides evidence that Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel wrote down part, at least, of their prophecies. Could anything be more suggestive in this connection than Ezekiel's vision of the heavenly book (ii. 9 f.; cf. Zec. v. 1)? Furthermore, Widengren argues that it is unnecessary to dismiss the prose discourses in Jeremiah and Ezekiel as unauthentic.

> When reading the late Maccan and the Madīnan sūrahs, we are everywhere confronted with long, monotonous sermons encumbered by stereotype (*sic*) expressions and interminable repetitions. Yet no one has hitherto adopted the method of literary criticism and declared that these sūrahs are to be ascribed to the literary and theological activity of later epochs when Muhammad's disciples disfigured the original purity of the master's revelations! On the contrary, prominent investigators such as Nöldeke and his followers have contented themselves with ascertaining the indisputable fact — corroborated by religious psychology — that the prophet has passed through a definite development leading Muhammad through the various stages of a prophet, a teacher, and a lawgiver.[32]

These are but a few of the arguments brought forward in Professor Widengren's study. Some of them, as he himself notes, had already been advanced in a rather different way by Van der Ploeg in an article which deals with the views of Nyberg, Birkeland, and Mowinckel, but not those of Engnell.[33]

In his most recent publication, The Call of Isaiah, Engnell does not deal with Widengren's observations, except very briefly in footnotes, for the most part. He repeats very concisely what he

[32] Op. cit. p. 81.

[33] 'Le rôle de la tradition orale dans la transmission du texte de l'Ancien Testament.' Revue Biblique, 1947, pp. 5–41.

had written in clarification of his view in reply to Mowinckel;[34] and, although he repeats the contention that the importance of oral tradition in the Old Testament is indicated by the analogy of other oriental literatures, he dismisses Widengren's arguments from Arabic literature by the assertion that the Old Testament is *sui generis*.[35] This rather paradoxical rejoinder will no doubt be amplified when Engnell's article 'Prophecy and Tradition' appears in a revised form in French in the near future.

The discussion thus far has shown that oral tradition is a factor to be reckoned with in the creation of the Old Testament books, and that the traditio-historical method is a valuable addition to the equipment of the critic. But it is an additional tool, and not one which supplants all others.[36] It is perhaps not superfluous to state the obvious fact that the scientific study of the Old Testament must begin with the material which we now have in the form in which we now have it. Since that material is now in literary form, the methods of literary criticism in the widest sense are hardly likely to be irrelevant to it. Mowinckel's statement of the methods by which the earliest elements in the prophetic literature may be recognized,[37] and Widengren's tentative but suggestive survey of the evidence from Arabic literature give some indication of the lines along which future investigation may proceed. Again, Engnell's own contention that oral tradition has played different rôles in the different literary types (a point also made by Van der Ploeg) is an important warning. The above survey has dealt almost solely with the prophetic literature, for it is in this connection that most of the recent debate has been carried on. The recognition of the work of the prophetic community in preserving and expanding the

[34] Op. cit. pp. 55ff.

[35] Op. cit. p. 57.

[36] The recognition of the importance of oral tradition in the formation of the Old Testament is, of course, nothing new. It is interesting to recall that more than a quarter of a century ago A. Lods could write, 'Des Allemands notamment ont érigé la méthode qu'ils appellent *traditionsgeschichtlich* en rivale et en ennemi de la *Literarkritik*, de la critique philologique et historique.' See his article, 'Le rôle de la tradition orale dans la formation des récits de l'Ancien Testament.' Revue de l'Histoire des Religions, lxxxviii, 1923, pp. 51–64. Widengren (op. cit. p. 68, n. 4) rightly draws attention to the important work on the character and origin of the prophetic literature by the Swedish scholar J. Lindblom (Die literarische Gattung der prophetischen Literatur, Uppsala, 1924).

[37] Prophecy and Tradition, pp. 42ff.

prophetic material has given us a new insight into the intimate relationship between the life of the community and the development of the literature. Here Mowinckel's Jesaja-disiplene must be regarded as a work of prime importance. On the other hand it is surely significant, as Van der Ploeg has pointed out, that it is precisely those prophets whose connection with prophetic communities is explicitly recorded from whom no considerable body of teaching has been handed down.[38]

II. The History of Old Testament Religion

Engnell does not include in his general discussion of literary problems any detailed consideration of the problem of the Pentateuch, which he leaves to his final chapter. His fourth chapter is a survey of his views on Old Testament religion. The inclusion of a discussion of religion in a work of general introduction is unusual; but here it is particularly valuable, since the views of the Uppsala School on the different aspects of Old Testament study form a unity. Engnell's views on Kingship are already familiar from his dissertation,[39] and further insight into the position of the School on the problems of religion is given by the works of Haldar,[40] Kapelrud,[41] and Östborn.[42] To discuss these more specialized studies here is both impossible and unnecessary: only a brief résumé of Engnell's general statement can be given.

His views are considerably influenced by recent work on high gods, and, in particular, by the important researches of Nyberg and Widengren in the Iranian field.[43] His position may be summarized briefly thus:

The old evolutionist theory of religious development can no longer be maintained — a gradual, consistent development from lower to higher, from preanimism and animatism through animism,

[38] Revue Biblique, 1947, pp. 38f. But cf. Mowinckel in Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift, 1942, p. 82.

[39] Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East, Uppsala, 1943.

[40] A. Haldar, Associations of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites, Uppsala, 1945; and Studies in the Book of Nahum, Uppsala and Leipzig, 1946.

[41] A. S. Kapelrud, Joel Studies, Uppsala, 1948.

[42] G. Östborn, Tōrā in the Old Testament, Lund, 1945. A less typical study.

[43] H. S. Nyberg, Irans forntida religioner. Stockholm, 1937. G. Widengren, Hochgottglaube im alten Iran. Uppsala and Leipzig, 1938. I have not had access to either of these works. Of great interest and importance also is G. Widengren's Religionens värld. Uppsala and Stockholm, 1945.

polydemonism, polytheism, and henotheism up to monotheism. Research into high gods has shown that monotheism precedes polytheism, or, at least, that polytheism is secondary to monotheism. First we have the high god, the god of the vault of heaven, the creator who is also, to begin with, the fertility god. Whereas, on the evolutionist view, many fertility and vegetation gods, which are personifications of the recreative power of nature, are subsequently fused into one, the vegetation god is rather to be thought of as an aspect of the high god which has split off, has been hypostatized, and so has become an independent deity. Thus the high god becomes a *deus otiosus*, but, as such, can be activated by the insight and activity of a man of the prophetic type and become associated with a tribe or group of tribes (Allah-Muhammad; Ahura Mazda-Zarathustra; Yahweh-Moses).[44] The God whom Moses knew as Yahweh (Yahweh-El) was the old, west-semitic high god, known variously as El, El 'Elyon, Shalem, and Sedek, and worshipped as El by the patriarchs. He was activated in the experience of Moses, and so became the God of the Israelite amphictyony. Because the El who was worshipped in Canaan was originally identical with the God of Moses, it was all the easier for there to take place that complete fusion of Canaanite and Israelite religion which Engnell presupposes. The following passage indicates his attitude:

> The victory of the Canaanite cult is practically complete. To look for the peculiarly 'Israelite' or 'nomadic' element is extremely difficult, not to say hopeless. . . . And the fact that the Canaanite cult is victorious means in reality that the Canaanite religion is victorious. For in the culture stratum with which we are now dealing cult and religion are two synonymous conceptions. Nevertheless, as already indicated, it is unmistakable that a new stamp, a new touch, is given by the desert blood to the development in its entirety.[45]

This Canaanite conquest was not retrogression but advance. From Canaanite religion, Engnell holds, Israel and the Old Testament received much, not least the messianic idea and the belief in resurrection.

[44] Cf. E. O. James, The Old Testament in the Light of Anthropology, London, 1935, pp. 83ff.

[45] Gamla Testamentet, I, p. 136.

In the fusion of the traditions of Israel and Canaan, and the conflation of Yahweh and El 'Elyon the influence of David is of special importance; but the establishment of the monarchy in itself was a decisive factor in the syncretistic process, involving as it did the introduction of sacral kingship.[46] In his doctoral dissertation [47] Engnell dealt in characteristic fashion with some aspects of this theme, which has, as is well known, been the subject of much study and debate among the older generation of Scandinavian scholars, and also in the United States and Britain; but he did not deal fully with the Old Testament evidence. For the present it must suffice to summarize his view as he himself has briefly outlined it in the Swedish Bible Dictionary.[48] The king is regarded as the son of the deity, and, at the same time, embodies in himself the entire community. He is responsible for victory, success, and prosperity; and he fulfills this responsibility, above all, in the annual festival, in which he appears in a double rôle. On the one hand he is the suffering Servant of Yahweh, atoning for the sins of the people, and, on the other, the victorious king overthrowing the powers of chaos in the ritual drama which led up to the ceremony of enthronement.[49]

Although Engnell speaks of a complete fusion of the Canaanite and the desert traditions, involving the victory of the former, he leaves room for Yahwistic reaction. The demand for exclusive loyalty to the God whom the fathers knew in the wilderness was not completely silenced, but was echoed by Rechabites, nazirites, seers, and prophets, including some of the canonical prophets. But

[46] Gamla Testamentet, I, pp. 140f. Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk, I, s.v. David. Engnell holds that David continued a process begun by Saul. His estimate of Saul's influence was briefly indicated in an article in the newspaper Svenska Dagbladet, January 30, 1944, to which I have not had access. The article on Saul in the Swedish Bible Dictionary will be contained in volume II, which has not appeared at the time of writing.

[47] Studies in Divine Kingship in the Ancient Near East, Uppsala, 1943.

[48] Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk, I, cols. 678, 1221ff.

[49] The sacral functions of the divine king are described by Engnell as messianic, in opposition to Mowinckel, who holds that the terms 'messiah' and 'messianic' are correctly used only in the eschatological sense. There is an excellent discussion of the debate in A. Bentzen's contribution to the Lindblom Festskrift ('Kan ordet "Messiansk" anvendes om Salmernes kongeforestillinger?' Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok, XII, pp. 36–50). Bentzen also discusses the question on pages 113ff. of his Det sakrale kongedømme, Copenhagen, 1945, a work which provides an admirable survey of Scandinavian literature on the whole subject.

the prophets had inherited less from the wilderness and more from Canaan than they realized. Their idea of God, for instance, was the result of the syncretistic process. Since Yahweh, El, and Baal had become one, there was no real conflict between Yahweh and El or Baal, but rather a tension between contrasted elements in the conception of the one deity, one side representing history and revelation, and the other representing nature.[50] It is in keeping with the above views that Engnell denies both that the prophetic attitude to the cult was one of unqualified and unvarying hostility, and that the so-called prophets of judgment had no message of hope.

The above is but the barest outline of some of the main contentions of Professor Engnell and his colleagues in this field. Many important and characteristic points have had to be omitted (e.g. the question of the indebtedness of the Uppsala scholars to the so-called myth and ritual school); and to attempt any sort of criticism is to lay oneself open to the charge of unfairness. The present writer hopes to offer at a later date a more detailed consideration of the questions raised. Meanwhile some general and tentative observations may be made.

Mowinckel[51] has criticized Engnell's use of the conception of high gods. He argues that both Engnell and Widengren include so many functions in the conception that it has ceased to have any precise meaning; and he maintains that Engnell is too ready to assume that different deities were originally identical. Moreover, the idea that Yahweh was ever 'otiose' is contrary to the emphatic consensus of Old Testament tradition. Two further comments may be made. To many it will seem that Professor Engnell's reconstruction of the history of Israelite religion does less than justice to the evidence of a real and lasting conflict between the distinctive Hebraic tradition and Canaanite religion. That Israel borrowed much from the latter is clear; and it is begging the question to assume that all such borrowing involved loss. But many would hold that the consciousness of Israel's distinctive inheritance was more widespread and profound than Engnell seems prepared

[50] Gamla Testamentet, I, p. 152, n.

[51] Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift, 1944, pp. 70ff. I owe my knowledge of Mowinckel's observations to A. Bentzen, Det sakrale kongedømme, pp. 32ff.

to admit. Secondly, in the view of the present writer, the characteristic pattern of Israel's faith and ritual is derived not from the common myth and ritual pattern of the ancient Near East, but from the events of the Exodus as recorded in Israelite tradition.

III. The Problem of the Pentateuch

The final chapter of Engnell's Introduction is headed 'The Problem of the Pentateuch.' In fact it deals with less and more than that. Since he has already outlined his own view of Israel's religious development, he does not deal in detail with the religious aspects of the Wellhausen theory, but confines himself almost entirely to the literary and philological evidence. On the other hand, he goes beyond the Pentateuch to deal with other narrative books of the Old Testament.

Having briefly surveyed the history of Pentateuchal criticism, Engnell mentions three factors which, he holds, tell against the Wellhausen theory: (i) archaeological discovery and linguistic research have increased our respect for the reliability of Old Testament tradition; (ii) *Gattungsforschung* has shown that different literary forms can come from the same source, and that repetition with variations is part of the narrator's technique; (iii) advances in the study of religion have shown that the Wellhausen theory is an artificial construction erected on the insecure foundation of the evolutionary hypothesis. 'Even if much clearing away has yet to be done, the recognition of this fact constitutes the most decisive contribution to the demolition of the (Wellhausen) academic structure and the final collapse of the Wellhausen era.' [52] A lengthy, but admittedly incomplete, list is given of scholars who, on various grounds have criticized the documentary analysis. It is hardly likely that a majority of them could have reached agreement either on their reasons for opposing Wellhausen or on an alternative theory. They are not, of course, appealed to as offering positive support for the view which is expounded in Gamla Testamentet, I. We begin to perceive the affinities of that view when we are reminded that in Scandinavia itself the commonly accepted view has been criticized in a searching, though fragmentary, fashion, by Pedersen in his article on Exodus i–xv, and in the notes to his

[52] Gamla Testamentet, I, p. 185.

monumental work.[53] No full-scale attack has yet been launched; nor does Engnell undertake to carry one through. He merely indicates his objections in principle, before proceeding to outline his own theory of the origin and composition of the books in question. These objections are as follows. (a) The presence of doublets is an indication, not of the existence of separate documentary sources, but of the process of oral tradition which lies behind the narrative. (b) Obscurities and apparent contradictions can often be understood in the light of Semitic psychology.[54] (c) The use of the different divine names is often arbitrary, and therefore not a reliable criterion for the analysis of sources.[55] (General differences in style and vocabulary are dismissed in a rather cavalier fashion as inconclusive.) (d) The theological and religious differences between the sources will not bear the weight of the arguments which have been erected upon them. This last point is put quite bluntly. 'One is hardly guilty of an unduly summary judgment if one asserts that these presumed differences are simply indications of modern logicism and hypercriticism.' [56] If J and E do not mention the centralization of the cult, that simply shows that the parts of the Pentateuch which have been attributed to these sources represent traditions which had their interests outside Jerusalem.[57]

Engnell's positive statement of his view has certain points of contact with that of Noth;[58] but apparently he had reached his own conclusions independently. He accepts the division of Genesis-Numbers (the 'Tetrateuch') from Deuteronomy-Kings (the 'Deuteronomic History'); but he criticizes Noth for using the methods

[53] 'Passahfest und Passahlegende', ZAW, lii. (1934), pp. 161–175. Israel, I–II. Second Danish edition, Copenhagen, 1934; E.T., Copenhagen and London, 1926. III–IV. Danish edition, Copenhagen, 1934; E.T., Copenhagen and London, 1940.

[54] Cf., e.g., Pedersen's discussion of Genesis xxxiv in Israel, I–II, E.T., pp. 521ff. Second Danish edition, pp. 410f.

[55] Cf. Pedersen, Israel, III–IV, E.T., p. 727. Danish edition, p. 544.

[56] Gamla Testamentet, I, p. 203. Engnell admits that there is a distinctive Deuteronomic theological emphasis.

[57] Engnell quotes from an article by Pedersen in Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift, 1931, pp. 156f. 'The narratives here referred to originated in circles which sought the true Israelite life outside the large cities, in the manner of life of the shepherds and semi-nomads; and they had no occasion to set specially high store by the claims of the Jerusalem priests.' (Quoted in Gamla Testamentet, I, p. 204, n. 1.)

[58] M. Noth, Ueberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, I, Halle, 1943. I wish to express my indebtedness to Professor H. H. Rowley, who kindly allowed me to consult his copy of this work and also of the issue of Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift mentioned in n. 12.

of literary criticism. Whereas Noth regards P, in the commonly accepted sense, as the literary basis of the collection Genesis-Numbers, into which J and E have been worked by a redactional process, Engnell holds that P is 'simply the last transmitter and editor of the "P-work" or "Tetrateuch." . . . This "P" (he or they) is responsible for the collections of laws which form the actual material behind "P," and has, at the same time, also set his theological stamp upon the work.' [59] Within the Tetrateuch there are two major divisions, the narrative material, contained mainly in Genesis but continuing up to the death of Moses, and the legal material in Exodus-Leviticus-Numbers. The centrally important section is the 'paschal legend' of Exodus i–xv, up to which the entire narrative of Genesis leads. The legal material consists of local collections, different in origin and development from the narratives, which were finally put into their present form in the post-exilic period. Engnell denies that P is anti-monarchical; for he finds in its central figure, Moses, the primal king. He also denies that the centralization of the sanctuary is presupposed, and follows Kaufmann in holding that it is a document associated with high-place worship, which could only with difficulty be assimilated to the later standards of Judaism.

In the Deuteronomic history (Deuteronomy-Kings) Engnell finds legal material of varying age, which has been edited in the interests of cultic centralization, followed by complexes of traditional narrative material. (It is interesting to note that we are promised a criticism, in Part II of his work, of the commonly accepted analyses of I Samuel viii–xii.) In this second great collection Engnell allows for the incorporation of written documents. He dates its final compilation shortly after the Exile.

In the Chronicler's history Engnell admits the presence of a considerable proportion of material from documentary sources, and agrees that literary criticism can come into play here, but doubts whether it will achieve much. He therefore does not seek to do more than indicate the main sources, very much as the Chronicler himself indicates them. He agrees with Noth that David and the Davidic monarchy are the Chronicler's chief interests, and that his theological position is akin to that of the

[59] Gamla Testamentet, I, pp. 212f.

Deuteronomist. With the rough dating of this third collection somewhere in the period 400–250 B.C. Engnell's book ends, somewhat abruptly.

It is difficult to discuss views thus summarily stated; and for the full defence of Engnell's positions we must wait for the publication of the second part of his work. The general considerations advanced concerning the characteristics of Hebrew narrative style and the like may call for a modification of accepted views; but they hardly indicate their demolition. The recognition of such factors and of the influence of oral transmission on the material may well make it impossible for us to indulge in the clear-cut analyses which characterize many essays in criticism, particularly those of a generation or so ago. But the main structure of the Wellhausen theory was so firmly grounded in historical and religious as well as literary evidence that its destruction demands not merely arguments but a commentary. It is virtually this that Professor Engnell has promised us in the second part of his work, which, it is to be hoped, will soon be made available. Meanwhile we may be grateful for the stimulus of views which are challenging and suggestive even when they fail to convince.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

A most valuable and discriminating survey of recent Scandinavian work in every branch of Old Testament study is given by Professor A. Bentzen in his article, 'Skandinavische Literatur zum Alten Testament, 1939–1948,' in Theologische Rundschau, xvii, 1948/9, Heft 4, pp. 273–328. I am indebted to Professor A. R. Johnson for drawing my attention to this article, and for enabling me to consult it. Much useful information on the views of the Uppsala School is also to be found in Bentzen's Introduction to the Old Testament, 2 vols., Copenhagen, 1948 and 1949, which is a translation and revision of the Danish Indledning til det Gamle Testamente, Copenhagen, 1941. The same author's Messias — Moses redivivus — Menschensohn, Zürich, 1948, describes and discusses some aspects of the Uppsala theories on kingship. See also n. 49, above.

GHOST RITUAL IN AESCHYLUS *

H. J. ROSE
University of St. Andrews, Scotland

The object of this brief survey is to discover, if we can, from the surviving plays of Aeschylus how, in the opinion of enlightened and pious men of his age, the spirits of the dead were to be approached when it was thought desirable to do so, and to compare the methods which were then in use with those of other, especially of later, epochs. I speak of enlightened and pious men, for surely Aeschylus was both. Had he been born a generation later, he would probably have been something of a philosopher, influenced, as Euripides was, by the critical opinions of the contemporary sophists and investigating the fundamental assumptions upon which the traditional beliefs of his country rested. As it was, he, like his contemporary and acquaintance Pindar, came sufficiently early to take the form of their beliefs from tradition, with no more than revisal of details here and there (Pindar will not believe impious myths and does not know what to make of tales which represent the gods as fighting one another,[1] Aeschylus is not sure that a god will really feel human passion for a mortal woman [2]), ennobling the whole with their own lofty thoughts and feelings, in which the Athenian goes further than the Theban, for he was the deeper of soul and even the Apolline religion of Pindar, lofty though it is, the fruit apparently of a genuinely religious mind

(Inevitably, there is reference made to three standard works, (1). Th. Hopfner, Griechisch-ägyptischer Offenbarungszauber, Leipzig, 2 vols., 1921 and 1924. This is designated OZ, followed by the number of the volume and page and/or paragraph. (2). Same, article Nekromantie in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Vol. XVI. This is abbreviated HN, followed by the column and line of the volume in question. (3). K. Preisendanz, art. Nekydaimon, in the same volume, cited as KP with number of column and line. The same scholar's standard collection, Papyri graeci magicae, is also used, reference being by number of the papyrus in his arrangement followed by the line and the abbreviation P.)

* A lecture delivered before the Warburg Institute in London, Dec. 12, 1949.

[1] Pindar, O. i, 36 sqq.; O. ix, 35 sqq.

[2] Aesch., Aga., 1203. For the poet's varyingly serious use of such material, see my art. Theology and Mythology in Aeschylus, in Harv. Theol. Rev., XXXIX (1946), 1–24.

which had something mystical in it, lacks the sublimity of Aeschylus' attitude toward Zeus. We may be sure that neither of them was a prey to common superstitious terrors nor saw a bogey lurking behind every rock or tree on a dark night; but to both, the supernatural was quite real, something to be reverently but not uncritically considered. It was an attitude of mind which disappeared for a while after they and their generation had passed, to re-appear when a new and less respectable age of faith came to the world, brought about, not by lack of a developed critical philosophy, but by its degeneracy into a series of petty scholastic squabbles and the tired demand for something which might be accepted for the common man's belief without the fatigue of concentrated thought.

Aeschylus, then, like the best of his contemporaries, had a belief, but not a blind or ignoble one, in gods; with this went a belief in lesser powers, and these included the spirits of the dead, conceived as something more formidable than the empty phantoms of the Homeric House of Hades and more in accordance with the popular ideas which impelled the generations before and contemporary with both poets to worship, each at his own grave, the "gentry" [3] of former days when men were mightier, even as Homer himself had said. Since all, gods, men, ghosts, are subject to the righteous governance of Zeus, we may be sure that not even the most ghastly powers of the lower world will be without their share in ethical values; the ancient Erinyes are just and therefore in the last analysis good, but their justice is too narrow, which is why it needs revision in the fuller enlightenment which Athena has from her father; this seems to be the moral of that far from easy play, the Eumenides.

In one respect at least, all supernatural beings in Aeschylus would seem to share a characteristic of the Epic gods; it is no light thing for them to appear in visible form to mortal sight.[4] Of course, if a god or ghost appears on the stage, the audience must see him, for the audience (which after all is participating in a religious rite) shares for the time being the inspired sight and

[3] The precise meaning of *ἥρωες*, both in Homer and in hero-cult, is "gentlemen," "nobles."

[4] *χαλεποὶ δὲ θεοὶ φαίνεσθαι ἐναργεῖς*, Υ 131.

knowledge of the poet. But of the characters, I think I am right in saying that only those specially prepared or in a specially receptive condition can perceive figures not of this world. I do not count the ghost of Argos in the Prometheus,[5] for I think that simply a phantom of Io's crazed imagination. If Argos is really there, one would expect Prometheus and the Okeanids to see him, since they are supernatural beings themselves. But in the Choephoroe,[6] only Orestes sees the Erinyes, for their errand is to him only; the Chorus, who have shed no kindred blood and are the object of no supernatural penalties, think he is under a delusion. In the Eumenides, the priestess at once sees them, but she is Apollo's servant and was expecting, just before the horrible vision frightened her and made her a helpless, trembling old woman, to be inspired by him to prophecy.[7] Later in the same play, the divine characters and the Erinyes as well are apparently quite visible to everyone on the stage; but Orestes is the object of the direct interest of Apollo, Hermes and Athena, and of course of his pursuers, while the members of the Areios Pagos, meeting as they do under the immediate presidency of their city-goddess, clearly must have a revelation of her and be at the least able to hear the divine advocate for the defense, to say nothing of the two parties to the suit, as they take their places by the Stone of Outrage and the Stone of No Mercy.[8] Those ghosts which appear to anyone outside the two long scenes with which this paper is chiefly concerned are seen, in one case by a prophetess in her frenzy, in the other by creatures who are of the underworld as it is.[9]

It is therefore not surprising nor out of keeping with what we know both of Aeschylus' own beliefs and those of his people, that if anyone in his plays wants actually to get into contact with a denizen of the House of Hades, he uses elaborate ritual to do so. It seems worth while to ask if it is a peculiar ritual, due

[5] Aesch., P.V., 567.

[6] Cho., 1048 sqq.

[7] Eum., 29 sqq.

[8] *τοὺς δὲ ἀργοὺς λίθους ἐφ' ὧν ἑστᾶσιν ὅσοι δίκας ὑπέχουσι καὶ οἱ διώκοντες, τὸν μὲν Ὕβρεως τὸν δὲ Ἀναιδείας αὐτῶν ὀνομάζουσι*, Pausanias, i, 28, 5. The meanings of *αἰδὼς* and its compounds and cognates are well discussed in the relevant articles in Liddell-Scott-Jones.

[9] Aesch., Aga., 1096 sqq., 1217 sqq.; Eum., 116 sqq. In the latter case, "seen" is not quite accurate, for the Chorus are asleep when the ghost appears to them.

either to the poet's own imagination or some temporary or local custom of the Athenians. Before analyzing the scenes in question, therefore, let us look at two descriptions of necromancy, one much earlier than any surviving Attic play, the other about a generation later than Aeschylus' latest work; for we have no strictly contemporary document which throws any light on the procedure.

Homer, writing in the tenth century B.C.,[10] shows us, in one of his best-known episodes, Odysseus consulting a wise ghost. Odysseus lives on the outskirts of the Achaian world, and in some respects his ways are not exactly those of a normal Achaian gentleman; for instance, he uses arrow-poison on occasion.[11] So it is not very remarkable that the ghosts he knows are less helpless than the general run of "strengthless heads" of the departed, although he uses, or at all events represents Kirke as using in conversation with him, that stock phrase concerning them.[12] Like another borderer, Achilles, he finds them important enough to make sacrifice to on quite a large scale, which no man of his intelligence would think of doing if they could neither help nor hurt him.[13] Homer, not for the only time, shows here some knowledge of beliefs which were not current among the aristocrats for whose delectation he composed and recited his epics. It may very well be that many people at one and the same time conceived of ghosts as being strengthless and unsubstantial shadows and as beings in some ways more powerful than they had been in life; such self-contradictions are commoner in popular eschatology than even in other departments of the muddled thinking of untrained humanity. But be that as it may, an excellent adviser,

[10] This means precisely and literally what it says. I become steadily more convinced that Homer's activity was not later than about 900 B.C. and that he wrote his works, not necessarily in alphabetical characters. This latter fact accounts among other things for their preservation over so long a period with so little sign of interpolation, such as must almost inevitably have occurred had there been no early and authoritative written text to appeal to, while the absence of such a written text is reason enough for the complete disappearance of all earlier works, save for such passages, mostly short stock formulae, as he is reasonably thought to have borrowed from them. I take him to be the author of practically the whole Iliad and the whole Odyssey, as we now have them.

[11] α 260 sqq.

[12] *νεκύων ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα*, κ 521 etc.

[13] Ibid., 522–25.

no other than the witch-goddess Kirke, tells Odysseus exactly how to get into *rapport* with the spirit best able to advise him. Why she does not use her own supernatural power to give him all the information he needs, Homer does not condescend to mention. Indeed, it is a mark of the early and still rather naïve composition of his poems that when he wants a striking episode, he is not too meticulous in his way of leading up to it. Odysseus is to sail to the very House of Hades itself (evidently not to the depths of it, but to somewhere on the outskirts) and there first of all dig a pit in the ground and make triple libation into it, of honey mixed with milk (or water), wine and water, sprinkling barley meal upon the whole. Then he is to "pray much on bended knee" to the dead, vowing further offerings to them all and a separate one to the spirit of Teiresias, once he returns to Ithake.[14] All this done, he is to kill a ram and a ewe, both black, and let their blood run into the pit where the ghosts may conveniently drink it when he lets them. The carcasses are to be burned on the spot, after the usual way of disposing of chthonian sacrifices.[15] This is accompanied by a prayer to the chief gods of the lower world, Hades and Persephone, which seems to show that this part of the ceremony is not propitiation of the ghosts, but an attempt to gain the grace and protection of their rulers. The phantoms themselves are controlled by the threat of Odysseus' drawn sword.

We may, I think, safely take it that Homer gives us an account based upon real practices in his own time. His hero of course enjoys special advantages, for he is able actually to meet the ghosts on their own territory, wherefore they come in great multitudes of both sexes and all ages, and he has but to decide to which he wants to speak. Part of what he does might be done by any householder of classical times tending the family ghosts and bringing them the food and drink they need; the *βόθρος* is a regular feature of tomb-ritual.[16] Blood-offerings are on occasion made to them, but they are particularly characteristic of necro-

[14] Ibid., 519–20, with the note of Eustathios, p. 1668, 22, who says that in Homer *μελίκρητον* is supposed to be honey mixed with milk, but in later authors honey diluted with water.

[15] Ibid., 527 sqq., with λ 35 sqq., which supplements it in one or two details.

[16] Examples in G. P. Oikonomos, De profusionum receptaculis sacris (Athens, 1921), 8 sqq. It is of course found also in the cult of chthonian gods and in hero-worship.

mancy,[17] for then the enquirer wants the ghosts nearly enough alive to speak intelligibly when he questions them. Our other document helps us out here; it is of course a farcical parody,[18] but once more we must suppose it founded upon contemporary use, or who would understand the joke? Peisandros the oligarch consults a necromantic establishment presided over by Sokrates; he brings a strange and unwonted victim, a camel-sheep, whatever that may be, for at that date and place it certainly cannot be a llama. His object is to have communion with his own soul, which deserted him some time ago, thus accounting for his arrant cowardice. In this he does not succeed, for the phantom which comes to drink the blood of his sacrifice is that weird and uncanny creature Chairephon, who being surnamed the Bat is already enough like a Homeric ghost [19] to pass muster.

Turning now to Aeschylus, we begin by noting the absence of one outstanding feature in the above descriptions. His characters dig no pit and shed no blood. Technical reasons may partly account for this. To dig would be difficult on the Attic stage, whether, as I think, following Peripatetic tradition,[20] it was a low wooden platform extending across the end of the theatre next the *skene*, or, as archaeologists generally suppose, it was simply that part of the orchestra, or at most a board flooring directly laid on it.[21] In either case, there was a hard surface on which spades would make no impression. Again, actually to kill any beast during the play would present obvious difficulties. However, I think we may look rather deeper than questions of pure stagecraft. No one in the surviving plays of Aeschylus wants to rouse a phantom and give it temporary power to speak. The Persians in the play of that name call upon no ordinary man but the almost divine Dareios, who appears, much as a god might, in bodily form, sent back for a little while to the world in which he once lived. The children of Agamemnon want their father to hear them and give

[17] See S. Eitrem, Opferritus und Voropfer (Kristiania 1915), 416 sqq.

[18] Ar., Birds, 1553–64. Peisandros is said to have lost his ψυχή because he is cowardly and therefore ἄψυχος, cf., e.g., Aesch., Sept., 192.

[19] Cf. ω 5 sqq.

[20] As represented by Horace, following Neoptolemos of Parion, Ars Poet., 278–80.

[21] A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, The Theatre of Dionysus at Athens (Oxford 1946), 68 sqq.

them whatever help he can; but what would they want of his disembodied phantom, which can tell them nothing about his death that they do not know already, or his temporary reincarnation in a body which they know to have been deliberately mutilated by the murderers? [22] Apart from this, we shall see that the summoners of the dead in both plays behave substantially like Odysseus. Let us first look at the Queen of Persia and her faithful Elders.

Having decided to seek counsel from the only being they can think of who is likely to advise them in their critical situation, their first business is of course to prepare the materials for sacrifice. These are brought in all humility,[23] by the queen in person, perhaps with two or three attendants to help with the actual carrying of the objects she mentions, and consist of normal offerings to the dead, milk from a ritually pure cow (presumably one which has not been used under the yoke),[24] honey, water from a "virgin" spring, — again we must suppose one free from all pollution, perhaps from profane uses, — and wine which, it is specified, is from an old vine and "unsullied from its wild mother," which I take as signifying that the pedigree of the wine can be traced back to the first improvements of the wild vine from which the cultivated stocks had been developed, and that it is known, or supposed, that nothing has happened to it during the intervening generations which would make it unacceptable to the powers to be approached. To these are added olive oil and flowers made into wreaths. In all this there is nothing which we can take to be other than typical Greek offerings of the period, although chosen, it may be, with especial care, as befits the rank of the ghost to be approached and the greatness of the emergency. The queen, with or without assistance, pours out her gifts, presumably into some kind of pit or other receptacle at the tomb, and the Elders accompany her actions with an appropriate invocation, what is technically called a *ὕμνος ἀνακλητικός* and is so

[22] Cho., 439.

[23] *τοίγαρ κέλευθον τήνδ' ἄνευ τ' ὀχημάτων/χλιδῆς τε τῆς πάροιθεν ἐκ δόμων παλιν/ ἔστειλα*, she says (Pers., 607–9), whether this means on foot *and* without personal ornaments or on foot *and so* without her royal state (*τε* joining synonymous expressions).

[24] As, e.g., K 292–3.

styled by the poet himself as nearly as is consonant with his poetical and untechnical language.[25]

The hymn is a moderately long one, filling 57 lines of a modern printed text and falling into three pairs of stanzas with a preliminary invocation to the nether gods and a final summons to the ghost just as it is on the point of appearing. Its language is supposed, from the dramatic situation, to be Persian, just as the speech of the Danaids is supposed to be Egyptian and the dialect used by the disguised Orestes and Pylades to be Phokian.[26] This, in the regular Tragic fashion, is indicated by a single remark of the characters concerned, and we hear no more about it; unless indeed the lone foreign word, *βαλλὴν* for "king," is to be supposed a further indication. It is the comic foreigners of the Attic or Alexandrian stage who talk either broken Greek or some gibberish supposed to be their own outlandish tongue. It is definitely said that the hymn is clear and intelligible,[27] and indeed, for an Aeschylean chorus, it is unusually easy to make out. One outstanding peculiarity it has, however, which, as I think, impressed the audience which listened to it.[28] I mean the cries, *ἠέ* and *οἴ*, which follow four of the stanzas and no doubt were accompanied with appropriate gestures. This I fancy is neither peculiarly Greek nor peculiarly Persian, but simply regular magic ritual, of which more will be said presently.

As to the contents of the hymn, Dareios himself is not directly addressed until about half-way through. First they speak to Earth, Hermes and Hades, imploring them to let him appear to

[25] See Pers., 620–21.

[26] Supp., 119, 130; Cho., 563–4.

[27] *βάρβαρα σαφηνῆ*, Pers., 635, i.e., in clear, intelligible Persian (the Persian characters call themselves "barbarians" throughout the play, with no thought of it being derogatory, exactly as in Plautus *barbare* means *Latine*, *barbaria* Italy and *barbarus* Roman or Italian). I cannot imagine why Headlam wanted to alter the text here.

[28] Ar., Frogs, 1028–29, *ἐχάρην γοῦν ἡνίκ' ἐκώκυσαν* (*ἤκουσα codd.*) *περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεῶτος,/ὁ χορὸς δ' εὐθὺς τὼ χεῖρ' ὠδὶ συγκρούσας εἶπεν ἰαυοῖ.* The speaker, Dionysos, seems to embody the average silly-ass spectator; Aristophanes rather liked the average man, but clearly recognized that he was normally incontinent, a coward and a fool. He means, "Well, I did like it when they howled about Dareios being dead (Pers., 647–56 especially) and at once the chorus clapped their hands together like this and said Ochone!" This much, then, the audience may be expected to have carried away in their heads, a general memory of lamentable words, cries and gestures.

them. Persians they may be on the stage, but their choice of deities is good Greek throughout, and we may be the more confident that they use substantially the methods Greek necromancers would employ. Then they spend a stanza wondering if Dareios can hear them; now they turn once more to the nether powers and implore them more earnestly than ever to let the venerated ghost appear, for they reverence him, they love him, he governed them with more than human wisdom, he is their god, whom the other gods may well indulge. Now at last they feel that they have won the ear of their dead king. First they implore him to appear in his well-known form and dress, a Shah-in-Shah, no mere phantom nor in hideous and unknown shape. Then they pour out their woes to him; grievous and unheard-of disasters have befallen the nation, the darkness of Hell is over them, their young men are destroyed, their ships are no more. And with these last words sounding in the ears of the audience, the imposing figure of the dead king rises from his sepulchre and bids first the Elders, then, when he sees they are too much in awe of him to speak plainly, the queen to say what has happened. Evidently, he like Homeric ghosts [29] has no power to know what is going on in the contemporary world, though he can to some extent at least foresee the future and his advice is as wise as it ever was.

So we may say that the ritual has four main parts. Sacrifice is made; the gods of the underworld are invoked to let the desired end be attained; the dead man is praised and besought to appear; and the reasons for his presence are set forth. Let us now turn to the other great scene, the ceremony at the tomb of Agamemnon in the Choephoroe. Here there are several differences of background which are easily remarked. There is no public disaster on which the advice of the ghost is sought, indeed no advice is asked at all, but a rather vague invisible help. There is indeed a crisis, for the question whether or not Agamemnon's murder shall be avenged and his injured children restored to their rights is to be settled in the next hour or two; but the conspirators make their own plans, consult no one but each other, and are aided by nothing manifest to the senses except their own courage and quickness of

[29] E.g., the ghost of Achilles does not know how it fares with his father and son, λ 492 sqq.

wit. Agamemnon, like the gods who are also invoked, rather blesses than takes part in their actions. Formally, the whole business takes much longer, occupying the central portion of the play, lines 315–509, not counting the prayer uttered by the Chorus (306–14) as the actors move into their places, or not much less than four times the invocation of the Persian elders. A further difference in form is that the singing and speaking are mainly from the stage. Pylades takes no part, for the dead man is no kin of his; the Chorus offer comments, but hardly invocations to the dead; the gist of the long incantation is a duet between Agamemnon's two children, no doubt standing one on either side the tomb, while the chorus remain in the orchestra and Pylades perhaps near the side where the palace is supposed to be, on the watch for intruders. The long series of solos and choruses is so complicated that it is worth while to analyze it briefly.

315–23. *Or.* Father, how shall my words reach you?

324–31. *Cho.* Though dead and buried, all is not over with a man who has been foully slain.

332–9. *El.* Hear us, your hapless children.

340–44. *Cho.* God may yet turn ill hap to good.

345–53. *Or.* Would some noble enemy had slain you, to leave an honorable memory for us.

354–62. *Cho.* But doubtless so great a king has a high station below.

363–71. *El.* You should not have died at all, but your slayers.

372–9. *Cho.* That is too much to wish for; the house is sore stricken.

380–85. *Or.* True, and my heart breaks to hear it. Zeus, send just vengance, suffer who may.

386–92. *Cho.* Oh for the day when I raise the joy-cry over the corpses of the usurpers!

393–99. *El.* I demand the intervention of Zeus; when will it come? It should have been long ago.

400–04. *Cho.* Surely, blood will have blood.

405–09. *Or.* Gods below and above, what refuge have we but in you?

410–16. *Cho.* I hover between hope and fear.

418–22. *El.* What shall we say to move you? shall we tell of our mother's cruelty —

423–28. *Cho.* I am fit only to wail and lament.

429–34. *El.* Hateful that she was, she buried him in hugger-mugger, like an enemy and a man of no account.

434–38. *Or.* That was a dishonor which I will avenge upon her, if it costs my life.

439–43. *Cho.* His corpse was mutilated lest his ghost rise to avenge himself and you.

445–50. *El.* And I was sent to kennel like any dog, hardly allowed even to weep. Hear that, my father!

451–55. *Cho.* Aye, hear; and you, Orestes, be firm to avenge.

456–60. *Or.* Help us, father! *El.* See my tears. *Cho.* We all cry to you; rise to hear us, help us all.

461–65. *Or.* Might meets might, plea meets plea. *El.* Hear our prayers, ye gods! *Cho.* I tremble; can our prayers hasten on the decree of fate?

466–78. *Cho.* This house is sorely wounded and only itself can heal it. Gods below, hear and answer the cry of Agamemnon's children.

479–509. The regular (sung) ritual being now apparently ended, Orestes and Elektra in turn address impassioned spoken appeals to the ghost. Let him help them if he would receive the tendance which the dead need, if he remembers and would avenge the wrongs done him, if he has any love for his children or any desire that his house should endure. Mingled with these entreaties are two short prayers to Earth and Persephone to help.

This is I think enough to show that we have no ὕμνος ἀνακλητικὸς here. The ghost is addressed, and that in moving terms, but we find no cries to awake him from his slumbers, no repeated imperatives, "come," "appear," like those which summon Dareios, no indication that any visible manifestation is looked for. The nearest approach to this is the naïve appeal of the Chorus that Agamemnon should come ἐς φάος [30] to hear them better. The ghost, that is, is invoked in an analogous manner to the gods concerned; as they are asked to send punishment on the wrong-doers, so he is implored to help his children. Once, and once only, something like the presence of Agamemnon is wished for in the coming struggle; Orestes prays "O Earth, let my father rise to take charge of (ἐποπτεῦσαι) the contest." [31] But it is clearly an invisible presence, for the next line, which balances this one,

[30] Cho., 459.
[31] Cho., 489.

is a prayer of Elektra that Persephone will send, no visible figure, but "beautiful victory," κράτος, an uncompromising neuter noun, not νίκη, who is in some sort a goddess. Agamemnon is to be the invisible director of Orestes' and his confederates' efforts, as in life he directed the operations of his army.

Thus we see that there were in the days of Aeschylus at least two fashions of approaching the dead, apart from the regular ritual which went on at their tombs and the occasional or seasonal ceremonies intended to bestow a kind of ghostly alms on those who had no kin to keep up the usual tendance. They might be summoned, with all respect and with the accompaniment of offerings, to appear and give advice or information; or they might simply be asked to bless the doings of those who appealed to them. Voluntary appearances of the dwellers in the lower world are another matter, for since such things are unexpected and extraordinary, there can be no ritual for bringing them about, but only a correct procedure to be observed for stopping them or preventing them doing harm.

Let us now see how the procedures we have examined compare with those in use some centuries later, when we once more find illustrative documents. Two of these are in Latin, and at once we feel a new atmosphere, quite apart from the sensational rhetoric with which the whole scene is set out. Both Seneca and Statius show us Teiresias summoning the ghost of Laios, in the one case to say what is the cause of the plague afflicting Thebes in the days of Oedipus, in the other to prophesy concerning the impending war of the Seven. And Teiresias has distinct traits of wizardry about him. In Seneca, he quite frankly uses spells, *carmenque magicum uoluit*.[32] In the Thebaid, he explicitly dissociates himself from witchcraft and the foulnesses of black magic, but reminds the powers below that he can at a pinch use the magician's powers of compulsion, although his reverence for Apollo and a still higher power whom he will not name makes him reluctant to do so.[33] This is exactly the technique of Lucan's witch, when the authorities of hell are slow to produce the soul

[32] Seneca, Oedipus, 561; in Statius, Theb. IV, 549–51, Manto, at her father's bidding, uses something like a spell: carmenque serit quo dissipat umbras,/quo regit et sparsas; qualis, si crimina demas,/Colchis et Aeaeo simulatrix litore Circe.

[33] Statius, ibid., 503 sqq.

which she wants to restore temporarily to its lately left body. She threatens to summon the Erinyes by their real names, make Hekate appear in her native hideousness, tell the true story of Persephone and her dealings with Pluto, let light into the darkness of the underworld, and finally call up a power who lives in the very depths of Tartaros and thinks nothing of breaking the gods' oath by the Styx, — apparently someone very like Satan.[34] Apart from this, the difference is mostly one of tone; the Spaniard and the Neapolitan alike, after the romantic fashion of their times, pile on the traditional terrors, make the earth be cleft and a horrified observer of the performance (Kreon in Seneca, Eteokles in Statius) see all the traditional sights; Statius, with one of those flashes of better taste which he now and then was granted, cuts this part of the procedure short; *ne uulgata mihi*, says Teiresias to his daughter, and explains that he had visited the lower world (like Virgil's Sibyl) and seen it all for himself before he went blind.[35] But the actual ritual is in its main outlines the same as in the Persians or the Odyssey; the seer goes to a suitable place [36] and there sacrifices black victims and the usual drink-offerings of honey, milk and wine, which are poured into a trench. He then makes his invocation, and having established *rapport* with the ghost he wants to consult, he questions it. Still, the magical, or if we like the professional element is much to the fore. An Aeschylean consultant can and does, as we have seen, make his own arrangements for getting into touch with, at all events, his own family ghosts. Seneca's or Statius' heroes want expert help and conduct none of the ritual themselves. Later, at all events, some felt that the classical ghost-scenes were not complete without something more than the comparatively simple and informal prayers used by the characters in Homer or Aeschylus, for there existed in the days of Julius Africanus, that is in the third Christian century, at least two MSS. of the Odyssey which put into the mouth of Odysseus a prayer of some twenty lines, taught him by Kirke and comprising a string of divine names from all manner of sources, such as a conjuror of the time when the interpolation

[34] Lucan, VI, 730 sqq.
[35] Statius, ibid., 537 sqq.
[36] Seneca, ibid., 530 sqq.; Statius, ibid., 419 sqq. Cf. Virg., A.VI, 564–65.

was made would habitually use.[37] How devoid that epoch was of any critical sense is well known, but even then, so gross a forgery did not win wide acceptance. The fact, however, that it was made at all shows how dominant the more complicated necromancy had become. We have now to cast a brief glance over its methods and see exactly what had been added to those into which our analysis of the older authors has given us some insight.

In all our later material, two characteristics stand out prominently, whereof one perhaps has not been enough emphasized. The first is the foreign nature of the professionalism already spoken of; the conjuror, whether he seeks information from a ghost (necromancy proper) or assistance of some other kind, is often represented as being an Oriental and regularly uses Oriental formulae and names, or what are obviously meant to be such. Under "Oriental" I include Egyptian, inaccurately as regards geography but much less so in respect of culture and traditions. This, an effect of the backwash from Alexander's conquests, is very familar to all modern students. The second is, I think, less so, namely the lowering of status both of the enquirers and of the ghosts they consult. In Homer and Aeschylus, princes, nobles and counsellors of State seek the advice or the help of the departed spirits of kings and prophets. In our later documents, apart from imaginative pictures like those already quoted of great consultations in the mythical past, the experts, for all their pretensions, seem to be poor creatures for the most part, women of low standing such as Horace's Canidia, actual outcasts of society, like Lucan's Erichtho, wandering foreigners of more than doubtful reputation. But the spirits are of still lower grade. The characteristic ghost is now the *νεκυδαίμων*, as it was called in Egypt, and such a creature, although the name it goes by is fairly complimentary, was regularly nothing more or less than a nameless and kinless *βιαιοθάνατος*.[38]

That everyone has a fixed term of life, barring accidents, is a doctrine not so much stated anywhere in words as commonly

[37] Pap. Oxyr. 412; the inserted lines come between λ 49 and 51, the text being somewhat altered to fit them. The material is handily set forth in Vol. II, pp. 83–5 of V. Bérard's edition of the Odyssey (Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1924); his conclusions are amusing, but quite negligible.

[38] See in general KP, 2245, 31 sqq.

assumed; we still speak of the "untimely" death of someone whom disease, mishap or the chances of war has carried off before he is old. Such a death will have two effects upon the one who suffers it. In the first place, it will leave him restless and discontented, aggrieved because he has lost part of the life on earth to which he was entitled. In the second, it sends him into the other world still a vigorous spirit, who has not used up the energy he would otherwise have spent in living in the body. If he has not merely a general grievance against the universe for not letting him live out his proper term, but a specific one against a person or persons by whom his life has been cut short, he may be very dangerous. The baby ghosts in Virgil who fell victims to the high infant mortality of those days do nothing worse than wail; [39] but when the Corinthians stoned to death the innocent children of Medeia, their ghosts killed the Corinthians' children until, by advice of the oracle, measures were taken to appease them.[40] Here and elsewhere, it seems not to have been very certain whether the active agents were the veritable ghosts themselves or a spirit of vengeance [41] sent to punish those who had wronged them in life; either way, the wrath of the *βιαιοθάνατοι*, as all such spirits were technically called, was a thing to be diligently avoided. Hence, if a potent spirit of this kind could be pressed into the service of an expert, it would prove a valuable familiar or an energetic subordinate to enquire after whatever the consultant wanted to know. That is why Lucan's Erichtho and the horrible old woman in Heliodoros [42] use fresh corpses of men just killed in battle, the latter selecting the body of her own son. Erichtho explains that it will be much less trouble to make the ghost speak through organs which have not had time to dry up,[43] and indeed, when she has induced the spectre to re-enter

[39] A.VI, 426–29.

[40] Pausanias, II, 3, 6–7.

[41] Cf. Pausanias, I, 43, 7, a child of Apollo's having been exposed and killed by dogs, the Argives were troubled, not directly by the child's ghost, but by an avenging spirit, a Poine, sent by Apollo. In the Corinthian case (see last note), the statue which commemorated the event did not show the children, but a Deima, or fearful visitation, represented as a frightful-looking woman.

[42] Heliodoros, Aethiopica, VI, 14 (p. 175, 19 sqq. Bekker); for Lucan, see next note.

[43] Lucan, VI, 619 sqq., cf. 712 sqq., the ghost has not far to come.

its damaged, but not wholly unusable, body, it explains that it has not yet been beyond the borders of the lower world, on this side of Styx, and has gathered the material for the gloomy forecast which it makes of the coming campaign from what it could see of noteworthy Roman ghosts of earlier date and their behavior.[44] In Heliodoros, the ghost is quite chatty, once he has been compelled to overcome his natural desire of sparing his mother's feelings, for one thing he has to foretell is her near and violent death; he even gives, unasked, some account of the future adventures of the heroine of the novel, who is a horrified witness of the performance.[45] But perhaps the chief reason for dealing with *βιαιοθάνατοι* was not to get information, but the services of a familiar (*πάρεδρος*). St. John Chrysostom inveighs against the false belief of those who say a soul can become a daimon after death, and will not allow that this is supported by the doings of wizards who murder children to get the use of their souls as helpers.[46] If we will believe the pseudo-Clement,[47] Simon Magus did that very thing and was quite frank about it: pueri, inquit, incorrupti et uiolenter necati animam adiuramentis ineffabilibus euocatam adsistere mihi feci, et per ipsam fit omne quod iubeo. We must always be cautious how we accept statements about ritual murder, for the charge has a long and grim history of false accusations made against Christians in the early days and afterwards by Christians against Christians of heretical tendencies and by Gentiles of all beliefs and none against Jews; but at all events it was alleged that necromancers did this sort of thing and indeed, if a *βιαιοθάνατος* is needed, it is an understandable if highly immoral procedure to make one. This was not, if all tales be true, the only reason for human sacrifices; for example, Canidia in Horace kills a child by slow starvation in sight of food in order to use selected parts of his body as love-charms,[48] and the Armenian or Kommagenian *haruspex* is accused by Juvenal of examining the entrails of a boy

[44] Ibid., 777 sqq.

[45] Heliod., ibid., p. 177, 4 sqq.

[46] Chrysost., Hom. in Matth. XXVIII, (XXIX), p. 336 B-D Montfaucon.

[47] Recognitiones, II, 13. The Homilies, II, 26, make it clear that Simon himself killed the child, *παιδίου ψυχὴν τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος χωρίσας.*

[48] Horace, Epod., V, 29–40.

if those of a chicken or a puppy do not give sure enough omens.[49] But these fantastic horrors have nothing to do with ghosts.

It is time now to glance (space forbids doing more) at the "ineffable" conjurations which Simon Magus if we like to think so, lesser and nameless sorcerers assuredly, used to get the ghosts they wanted. This is an ἀγωγή for a familiar ghost; the ritual begins "where someone lies (buried) or, if you have no corpse, then where something has been thrown away." [50] This I interpret as a rubbish-heap, where houseless and untended ghosts might be expected to prowl for scraps. With a special ink, the magician writes on an ass's skin (the procedure is Egyptian, and so he uses Set's beast as connected with the infernal world) a long string of gibberish, including one or two recognizable divine names, and then: "I conjure you, spirit of the dead, by the mighty and inexorable god, and by his holy names, to appear to me this coming night in the shape you had (when alive) and inform me if you are able to accomplish such-and-such a thing; now, now, quickly, quickly." This is laid out at sunset in the appropriate place, and in a dream that night the ghost will assuredly come, give information about himself and his powers, and say "Command what you will and I will do it." The operator now uses a fresh charm. After the usual string of impressive nonsense, he says, "I conjure you, spirit of the dead, by the Constraint of Constraints, to present yourself to me, X., in this day, in this night (obviously these are alternatives) and agree to serve me; if you will not, expect further torments." The agreement once made, the operator should provide himself with sundry mysterious writings and drawings which will bring the ghost to him at short notice; such a spirit is recommended if one wants to attract someone, to make him ill, to get dreams or to put a binding spell on any person. Two new features are prominent here; the operator uses meaningless words and names, supposed to be potent, and he does not request the ghost to do what he wants, but commands him with threats. Also, the usual sacrifices are replaced by magical objects of sundry kinds, supposed to act by some sort of sympathy directly upon the dead.

In this wretched little πάρεδρος, sent on occasion to do mischief

[49] Juv., Sat. VI, 548–52.
[50] IV 2015 sqq. P.

or help in some hole-and-corner intrigue, we may say that we have the degenerate, professionalized descendant of the mighty shade of Agamemnon watching grimly over the pious work of his son and daughter. The natural tie of kinship which makes the invocation of Agamemnon's injured spirit a dignified thing is replaced by an artificial bond, created by words of power, the more meaningless, apparently, the better, scribblings with various strange fluids upon various substances, and blatant threats of hell-pains which the stupid ghost apparently takes at their face value. Almost without exception [51] these spirits are harmful and used for the harmful purposes of sorcery, a totally selfish business, when they are not doing harm or causing fright of their own volition, like the occasional phantoms of the murdered which drive mortal tenants out of the houses where their bones are buried.[52]

In contrast with this sort of performance, necromancy proper, the raising of a ghost, in bodily form or otherwise, simply to ask it questions, is comparatively respectable. There continued till quite late in antiquity to be recognized, official places where there was supposed to be a Hell-mouth. Here it was comparatively easy to get into touch with the departed, if proper sacrifices were made, and the form which the reply of the ghost took was regularly an appearance in a dream.[53] That at least was what was generally expected in the days of Julian the Apostate and later,[54] and whoever wrote the Consolatio ad Apollonium falsely ascribed to Plutarch has left us a fairly detailed description of one such vision. A certain Elysios, an Italiote Greek, had a son called Euthynoos, who died under circumstances which his father thought suspicious; the family was wealthy and the dead youth the sole heir, wherefore there was motive enough for some unknown rascal to have poisoned him in hopes of stepping into his place. Elysios therefore went to a ψυχομαντεῖον, as these Hell-mouths were called, offered the usual sacrifices, lay down and went to sleep. In a dream he saw his own father, and implored him to make known

[51] KP 2245, 31 sqq.

[52] Plautus, Most., 484 sqq.; Pliny, epp., VII, 27, 4 sqq. Both are manifestly from Greek sources. Cf. Lucian, Philops., 31.

[53] HN, 2232,9 sqq.

[54] S. Cyril of Alexandria, Contra Iulianum, X, 340B Spanheim.

what had happened to Euthynoos. The ghost replied, "That is what I have come for," and bade him take a tablet which another phantom, the ghost of Euthynoos himself, offered him. In this was written a short message to the effect that the death had been natural and the reason for it was that it was no longer for Euthynoos' own good or that of his parents that he should continue in life.[55] Here, certainly, we have something better than hole-and-corner sorcery, and the result was good, the quieting of groundless suspicions which were aggravating the distress of the bereaved father; supposing, that is, that the story is true, and I see no cogent reasons for disbelieving it, since after all it amounts to no more than this, that a man in deep sorrow performed certain rites in the efficacy of which he believed, and afterwards had a dream which comforted him. There is little or no foreign magic here, and the consultation does not seem to have differed essentially from those held from early times at the shrines of oracular heroes such as Amphiaraos or of minor gods such as Trophonios who were confused with them.

It would therefore seem that the private practitioners of necromancy were not always disreputable nor always the purveyors of falsehoods, unsupported by any arguments and accompanied by a gross ignorance of the art of divination, that Artemidoros of Daldis makes them, and several other kinds of soothsayers, out to be.[56] Indeed, Artemidoros himself gives away most of his case a few lines further on, when he classes the dead among the certainly truthful: "for those who deceive with falsehoods do so because of hope or fear, while those who have no hopes and no fears may be expected to tell the truth, and the dead in particular are such." His objection therefore would seem to be that necromancers do not really bring themselves or their clients *en rapport* with geninue ghosts. It is probably not unjust to compare them to the spiritualistic mediums of to-day, who would seem to include everything from the grossest charlatans to abnormal persons who genuinely pass into trances and honestly believe that their vocal organs are then used by disembodied spirits. Like modern mediums again, necromancers sometimes

[55] [Plut.], Moralia, 109 B-D.
[56] Artemid., Onirocr., II, 69, p. 161, 20–26 Hercher.

found clients in very respectable society, such as that Appius Claudius who was a colleague of Cicero in the college of augurs,[57] to say nothing of exalted sinners with murders on their consciences or a lively fear of being murdered themselves, out of revenge or envy.[58]

The degeneracy was rather in the character of the ghosts consulted, and this is one side of the general history of hero-worship and allied movements. There can be no reasonable doubt that the "heroes" of early cult were simply "the gentry," the powerful ghosts of men who had been powerful in life, or distinguished in one way or another. Between such persons and minor gods there never had been a sharp cleavage, witness the recurrent statement in Homer that this or that chieftain was "honored in his district even as a god", and the occasional encounters between even a great god and a prominent prince like Achilles, in which they speak to one another almost as equals. That a large proportion of the heroes worshipped up and down Greece are figures of epic, whether originally real persons or not, is a commonplace, and many more are old members of princely houses, doubtless in numerous cases real ancestors of families still existing or at least clearly remembered when the cult began.[59] But the democratization of society, followed by the reduction of all subjects of an absolute or nearly absolute ruler to about the same level, reacted upon cult as upon many other features of Greek life. To be a worshipped hero after death, it was no longer necessary to have held very high social position when alive. The notorious case of Kleomedes of Astypalaia is instructive in this connection,[60] none the less for being relatively early. He was disqualified in the seventy-first Olympiad, i.e., in 496 B.C., for killing his opponent in the boxing-match. Going mad with disappointment, he overthrew the column on which the roof of a school in his native town rested, bringing the roof down on the heads of the children within. The people naturally tried to stone him, and he, taking refuge in a chest in the temple of Athena, had mysteriously disappeared when

[57] Cicero, Tusc., I, 37, de diuin, I, 132.

[58] As Nero, Suet., Nero, 35; Caracalla, Herodian, IV, 12,4.

[59] Abundant illustrations in L. R. Farnell, Greek Hero-cults and ideas of Immortality (Oxford, 1921).

[60] Pausanias, VI, 9, 6–8.

it was broken open. Delphoi pronounced him "the last of the heroes" and bade the Astypalaians "honor him with sacrifices, as being no longer a mortal." Again supposing that the story is true (and why should a hero-cult acquire so discreditable a foundation-legend, if it was not substantially based on fact?) we have no reason to suppose that this unfortunate case of homicidal mania was a ἥρως in the old sense, that is to say, of particularly good family; that he was of respectable parentage is likely from his having been an athlete, however. But Delphoi clearly sensed a tendency to make honored ghosts of all manner of persons who in their lives had done nothing to deserve such a position, and the text of the oracle bears witness to an attempt to close the canon of heroes. This was not wholly without success; hero-cults of later date than this are few, being mostly cults of the founders of settlements. But the conviction that the ordinary person counted for something in the next life, if not in this, formed a part of sundry religious movements, not least of that group which we refer to collectively as Orphic. A good example is the famous Petilia tablet [61] with its extract from some lost document, clearly a Book of the Dead of an unknown sect, call it Orphic, Orphic-Pythagorean or what you will. Its date is somewhere in the fourth or third century B.C. The soul, after painful wanderings in which it nearly perishes of thirst, is given water to drink from the Mere of Memory, "and then," says the comfortable prophecy, "thou shalt bear rule among the other heroes." Now the fact that these verses are inscribed on a thin golden tablet is enough to show that the deceased for whose guidance they presumably were intended was not of the poorest of the people; but his claim to the posthumous rank of hero would seem to depend, not on his social position in life, but on his adherence to whatever exact rites and doctrines his sect taught, and in particular to his knowledge of where to go in the other world, whom to address and in what form of words. That philosophical schools of the more transcendental kind speculated in a parallel direction, by making everyone's future condition depend upon his moral conduct in this life, not on his social status, is a commonplace.[62]

[61] A. Olivieri, Lamellae aureae Orphicae (H. Lietzmann, Kleine Texte, 133, Bonn 1915), p. 12.

[62] A sketch of some of the most important is given in OZ, I, par. 259 sqq.

Thus two forces pulled the same way, the levelling out of society until its distinctions were merely economic and not genuinely social (as in the fancies of some present-day theorists) and the strong insistence by the best minds on the all-importance of conduct as opposed to mere outward advantages, whether of rank or anything else. Such teaching was sure to be vulgarized sooner or later; we have but to look in Lucian [63] to find that for some minds the concept of the other world as a place where all were equal, because all alike were of little or no account, had its appeal. In consequence, any powers which a ghost might be supposed to have were easily enough extended to all ghosts, and the choice of one to evoke was as likely as not to be dictated by its supposed readiness to bestir itself. Hopfner sums up the situation well: [64]

> Für gewönlich aber bedeutet in der Spätzeit unserer Zauberpapyri ἥρως nichts anderes als νέκυς oder νεκυδαίμων, also nichts anderes als irgendeine Menschenseele nach ihrer Trennung vom Leibe durch den Tod. . . . So findet sich hier [in certain passages which he quotes] also ἥρως in der ganz abgeblassten Bedeutung des Wortes bei Homer als tapferen Held und Rufer im Streite [he misunderstands the Homeric use]; aus den halbgöttlichen Recken und Heerkönigen sind die "Helden" der Arena geworden oder überhaupt gefallene Lanzknechte.

Let us now look back to the conjuration of Dareios in the Persians.[65] The Elders emphasize again and again that it is no common ghost they wish to summon; they remind the nether gods and Dareios himself of his high rank, as well as of their affection for him. I translate the most relevant expressions: "Does the blessed one, the king who is the equal of gods, hear me? . . . Earth and ye other rulers of those below, give consent that a high one, more than mortal, Susa's breed, the Persians' god, may come forth from your abodes. Send up to us one whose like the land of Persia never covered. Dear he is, and dear his tomb . . . Aïdoneus, oh send and escort to the earth our only ruler, Dareios; send him, Aïdoneus! . . . King, ancient king, come, come! . . . hither, beneficent father Dareios." This is mingled with praises of the greatness of the dead king when on earth and the glories of his

[63] For instance, Menippus, 15 and indeed almost the whole dialogue.
[64] OZ I, par. 250.
[65] Aesch., Pers., 633 sqq.

reign, contrasted with the sad condition of the nation under his degenerate successor. The tone is unmistakable; it is one of reverence and worship, addressed to a being so superior to those who call upon him as to be very nearly a god, as indeed they say he is. If we compare the address to Agamemnon in the Choephoroe, we shall find it but little less humbly reverent, and thus may, I think, fairly conclude that to Aeschylus and the best contemporary opinion, that was the proper way to speak to a hero worthy of the name, however much the prayers and adjurations of real life may have fallen short of the poetical glories of the great plays.

Here, then, we have not simply a difference or development in ghost-ritual but a total change of tone, from the prayers of pious consultants to the threats and magical jargon of wizards, and corresponding to this, an alteration of the most fundamental kind in the conception of the nature of the spirits addressed, who no longer are of high estate but fallen to be the tools of anyone who has mastered the technique of summoning them. Some complimentary epithets, it is true, are still employed, the word *νεκυδαίμων* itself, for instance, being of that nature, but the general status of the "heroic" dead has degenerated until they are but proletarians beside the kings and nobles of Aeschylean ritual. Since anyone, even the victim of a murdering sorcerer, can be a "hero" after death, these are grown too common to be impressive; the necromancer might with little alteration echo Nero's words, *stulte uerebor ipse cum faciam deos*.[66]

We have thus sketched the decline of a not unimportant part of Greek religion. To begin with, the great dead were beings somewhat below divine rank, but well above the common level of mortality. Their advice could be asked and their help sought as reasonably as like appeals might be made to visible potentates upon earth. Such a procedure may be as reputable as the cult of the saints in Catholic Christianity, and indeed depends upon a not very dissimilar assumption, that persons of more than common worth went on occupying a high rank after their death. The difference was of course that the moral, still more the theological, status of the dead was not the primary ground of the devotion

[66] Pseudo-Seneca, Octavia, 461.

shown them or the trust reposed in them. No one, I suppose, was the readier to consult Amphiaraos because he felt convinced that that hero while on earth had been a good and affectionate father to Alkmeon, and certainly not because he supposed him to have entertained sound views about the nature and powers of Apollo. But, apart from some few survivals of old places where ghosts might be consulted, the belief became a mere superstition to the effect that any and every ghost had supernatural powers, and further, that these powers might, without regard to the natural relations and affections of the spirit in question, or to any moral considerations, be forced into the service of the curious, the ambitious, or the merely lustful or spiteful, provided that he went through the correct words and actions. Such phantoms would not have dared to look Dareios or Agamemnon in the face, even as their consultants would have cringed before Atossa or Elektra.

THE ROW HERESY

GEDDES MacGREGOR
Bryn Mawr College

On may 25th, 1831, an aged Presbyterian clergyman rose to his feet in the supreme ecclesiastical court of Scotland, the General Assembly, to utter a final plea for his eldest son, who stood accused of a charge of the utmost gravity before the venerable tribunal which was about to determine his fate. An interrupter protested that intervention at that stage was out of order; nevertheless the court allowed him to continue, and at length he ended with these words:

"I bow to any decision to which you may think it right to come. Moderator, I am not afraid for my son; though his brethren cast him out the Master whom he serves will not forsake him; and while I live I will never be ashamed to be the father of so holy and blameless a son."

The Moderator, when the judgment of the court had been given by an almost unanimous vote, solemnly invited an old and trusted member of Assembly to offer prayer. Then he said:

"In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, the sole King and Head of his Church, and by virtue of the power committed by him to it, I do now solemnly depose Mr. John M'Leod Campbell, minister of the parish of Row,[1] from the office of the holy ministry, prohibiting and discharging him from exercising the same, or any part thereof, in all time coming, under pain of the highest censure of the Church[2]; and I do hereby declare the Church and Parish of Row vacant, from and after the day and date of this sentence."

[1] Row is a village in Dumbartonshire, Scotland, pronounced *roo*, and now spelt *Rhu*, a reversion to the original spelling. The case here described is commonly known as "the Row heresy."

[2] There are five judicial censures which, traditionally, may be administered by the Kirk to her clergy: admonition, rebuke, suspension, deposition, and excommunication. This last is the one referred to in the sentence quoted, where "the highest censure of the Church" is threatened. But deposition, which excludes the offender from enjoying either the spiritual or material benefits of an office to which he has been appointed for life, was accounted a ferocious penalty, and it is one which the Kirk's rubrics direct should be "resorted to only in very serious cases."

That the accused John M'Leod Campbell was "holy," as his father had said, was common knowledge which scarcely one among the vast array of his ecclesiastical judges would have sought to dispute. At the time of his trial he was thirty, having been ordained to the ministry five years previously, and his tender zeal and humble piety were widely recognized. His own flock in the quiet and beautiful little West Highland parish of Row, apprised of the proceedings which had been initiated against their pastor in the inferior ecclesiastical court, the local presbytery, had sent in a formal petition "unto the Venerable the General Assembly," recounting his diligence among them, expressing their profound gratitude for "having so zealous and holy a man as their minister," and earnestly praying that he might not be taken away from them. This petition was signed by four hundred and twenty persons, representing about ninety-five per cent of the inhabitants of the parish, apart from the few dissenting houses, and including one hundred and fifty "heads of families." In the remaining five per cent must be included the indifferent and incapacitated as well as disaffected parishioners if any of these last existed at all.

The charge was a doctrinal one. Against the accepted view of the Kirk, based on her official doctrinal standards, Campbell had gradually come to preach, and had continued to do so in spite of the counsels of brethren of longer standing in the ministry, that Christ had died for all men. Yet he had always sought to deny, as he did at the public prosecution in Assembly, that this view was heretical according to these Calvinistic standards which the Kirk, then in the heyday of her influence and power, so relentlessly upheld. Nevertheless, the Assembly found in this plea nothing to mitigate his guilt. It is true that a few who were present declined to vote and that some did not answer their names when called; it is likely that, of about two hundred other members who had been present earlier in the Assembly, many had expressly absented themselves in order to avoid the responsibility of voting one way or the other; and it is especially noteworthy that Thomas Chalmers (who, as the most outstanding figure in Scottish ecclesiastical history since the establishment of Presbyterianism in 1690, was within twelve years of Campbell's trial to

lead the disastrous Disruption of 1843) had not a single word to say. The voting however made plain the formidable weight of the judgment: 119 of the judges were in favor of deposition, 6 against it.

It has been truly said that in order to understand the history of Scotland from early days up to comparatively recent times it is almost sufficient to understand the ecclesiastical history of Scotland; so much have the social life and political struggles of that country been associated with her internal religious strife. The Reformation, which, under Knox, took a more popular and violent form than elsewhere in Europe, marked not only the culmination of a spiritual disorder which had been observed and lamented by the pious Queen Margaret on her coming to Scotland in the eleventh century, but also the beginnings of a fierce ecclesiastical struggle whose asperity has been unparalleled in the history of Christendom. This grim warfare was never more bitter than in the seventeenth century, when the feud between the opposing forces of Episcopacy and Presbyterianism, most intimately connected with long-outstanding quarrels and political aspirations, touched every home in the land. Knox and the other earlier Reformers, thoroughly indoctrinated with Calvinism from the continent of Europe, had bequeathed to Presbyterian Scotland certain general ideals and notions of ecclesiastical polity; but the Kirk, as finally established in the last decade of the century, was bent on a far more radical application of these than had previously been undertaken, and throughout the eighteenth century gradually reached the point at which the most tyrannical enforcement of her will was not only possible but, for the maintenance of such semblance of national independence as was left to Scotland after the Union of Parliaments in 1707, politically expedient. The despotic power which the Kirk in the eighteenth century wielded over a rough, hard, northern people, was won with their general approval. The small native Episcopal Church, oppressed and unpopular because of its old associations with the Jacobite cause, meant little in the life of the people as a whole, and even today its members, though now very much more influential in the social and religious life of Scotland, represent an extremely small percentage of the population. The toleration ex-

tended to this Church by the State in 1712, for the benefit of those of its clergy who were willing to swear allegiance to the House of Hanover, certainly did not mitigate the Kirk's unrelenting hatred and suspicion. As for the hounded "Papists," they did not count at all. If in Defoe's England there were "a hundred thousand stout country-fellows . . . ready to fight to the death against popery without knowing whether popery was a man or a horse," these would have found counterparts in Scotland ready to affirm beyond all doubt that he was the Antichrist. And perhaps the most remarkable circumstance of all for an understanding of the situation is the fact that Scotland was almost entirely untouched by English Dissent, which even today is on the whole an alien element which survives only with difficulty and whose adherents either find themselves ill at ease in the religious life of the people or else tend to pass over into the main Presbyterian stream. Even the Wesleys made hardly any impression north of the Border. The Kirk did indeed, in the eighteenth century, lose some of her people through secessions from her own ranks; but these had very little effect on her rising influence, tending rather to strengthen this. By the beginning of the nineteenth century she seemed to be more firmly implanted in Scottish life than anything had ever been before; her doctrine, her polity, her structure, appeared to be immutable.

Those who knew her best had nevertheless many misgivings; nor without reason, for she was on the verge of the ten-year internal struggle leading to the most devastating schism in Scottish history, the Disruption of 1843. Throughout a century in which Scotland had produced scarcely a single noteworthy page of theology, the Kirk's Calvinism had hardened almost to the point of total sterility. There was a very strong prejudice which, according to Lord Sands,[3] persisted in country districts as late as the 1860's, against what were called "practical" sermons, that is, sermons which touched in any way directly on specific moral questions such as stealing or lying. All pulpit oratory had to be moulded to a rigid, monotonous pattern, exhibiting what was held to be strict Calvinistic orthodoxy at every turn, notably the doctrine of the restricted Fatherhood of God, and the least deviation

[3] The Order and Conduct of Divine Service in the Church of Scotland, p. 43.

from this staple diet, the slightest hint of even an untraditional emphasis, not only was a bad mark for the preacher but placed him directly under suspicion of heterodoxy. All that pertained to public worship and was not sermon was styled "preliminary," and had fallen into a dismal state. Instrumental music was rigorously forbidden; metrical psalms were sung dolefully and in an eccentric nasal fashion. The clergy commonly entered the church wearing their hats and gloves, a survival from pre-Reformation times remarkable in pulpits from which thundered hebdomadal denunciations of popery. The gloves were usually removed before sermon; the hat not until its wearer had solemnly bowed to each of the heritors [4] in turn. The worshippers also tended to enter church covered; moreover, they stood, sat, sprawled on their stools, or leant against the wall, according to their inclination, and would spit into the puddles on the earthen floor out of which, due to a widespread neglect of church fabric, sometimes protruded the very bones of their own dead. The Sacrament of Communion, which Calvin had wanted to make the regular Sunday-morning service, had become instead an annual or half-yearly event surrounded by elaborate and dreary prayers and fastings extending over a week. Nor did Christmas or Easter temper the gloom: the Kirk, which had regarded the restoration of the Christmas vacation in the Law Courts as the crowning insult of the Toleration Act of 1712, abhorred and studiously left unrecognized such seasons, taking moreover special care that Holy Communion be celebrated on dates which, as far as practicable, would not come near them.

Gaining almost universal control of the education of children, the Kirk inculcated fear that was not always of God, for public ecclesiastical discipline took unimaginative forms. Though the *jogges*,[5] familiar in both pre- and post-Reformation Scotland, eventually fell into disuse, they must have remained a fearful

[4] Trustees of ecclesiastical property.

[5] Iron rings for the neck, used in public punishment ordered by the courts of the Kirk. Specimens may still be seen hanging outside the doors of some churches in Scotland; there is one at Duddingston, Edinburgh. Dr. George Sprott, a careful historian writing as late as 1868, says that, "till within a few years a common threat to children was: 'The Minister will put you in the jogges.'" But they had nevertheless fallen into general desuetude by Campbell's time.

reminder to all who passed by them. But discipline degenerated into the no less cruel practice of publicly disgracing certain offenders, notoriously often ignorant young girls, by arraigning them before the Minister and his Session ("Elders") in the most deeply humiliating circumstances. Neither the Moderate nor the Evangelical Party could effectively temper the development of the grotesque form of Calvinism which held Scotland in its grip. Christian influence from other lands was excluded by the people from their Kirk, symbol of national independence, and it is plain that their religion transformed them less than they transformed their religion. In almost complete isolation from the rest of Christendom, the Kirk pursued her course with an eye on her chief object, the domination of Scottish life at all costs.

Donald Campbell, the father of the "Row heretic," was born in Skye in 1758. Educated at the University of Aberdeen, he married, in 1798, Mary, the youngest daughter of M'Leod of Raasay, who died eight years after the marriage, having borne three children of whom John, born in 1800, was the eldest. John spent his boyhood very quietly at the Manse of Kilninver, Argyllshire, his father's parish. His father seems to have been a man of simple tastes and a quiet disposition; according to his son, he preached in the tradition of Tillotson,[6] which certainly was not the norm for his contemporaries. John went up to the University of Glasgow in 1811 — such an early entry was not uncommon then — and read there till he was about twenty, when he went to Edinburgh University for a final year. In 1821 he was licensed to preach, but, being considered too young, he was not ordained for some years. There is evidence that he had wanted, during these intervening years, to go to Oxford for further preparation, and that he was deterred from doing so out of loyalty to the Kirk: he had no objection, he wrote to his sister at the time, to that part of the Oxford oath which bound him to the view that the Book of Common Prayer was agreeable to the Word of God; but the promise to use it "and none other" was plainly incompatible with his intended ministry in the Kirk of his fathers.

Inheriting a dislike of the Kirk's party factions, he went to Row

[6] Letter to his eldest son, March 8th, 1870. Memorials (2 vols., Macmillan, 1877), edited by Donald Campbell, the son of John M'Leod Campbell; vol. i, p. 72.

in 1825, determined to keep out of them and exhibiting all the zeal and earnestness one could wish for in a young clergyman. On the first day of his rounds of pastoral visitation, in which he always manifested exemplary fidelity, his last call was on an old couple in a cottage near Garelochhead. As he left the cottage, they accompanied him as far as the brow of the hill overlooking the beautiful lochside. Then, shaking hands warmly with the new incumbent, the old man pleaded with simple, peasant earnestness enlivened by Celtic fervor, "Give us plain doctrine, Mr. Campbell, for we are a sleeping people"; to which his wife gravely added an apocalyptic quotation: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." A humble pastor, Campbell never forgot either of these two salutary injunctions spoken in love by his parishioners and friends.

By about the end of 1827, however, his preaching was being discussed with evident disapproval at gatherings of clergy in Glasgow and even in Edinburgh itself. Some of his clerical brethren had professed to be attracted, at first, to that part of his doctrine which declared the first step in religion to be assurance of God's love to his children and of their "individually having eternal life given them in Christ." But they were shocked, even the most broadminded among them, when they heard him go so far as to speak of Christ having died for all men. It was objected that, were this the extent of the Atonement, then the assurance of which he spoke could have little value. To Campbell this was like saying that the sun has little value because it shines on all the earth; or that it would be "sunnier" if it shone on only part of this. But when he met his detractors to explain his doctrine more fully, he found them so ill disposed to listen that discussion was impossible. As soon as they saw that they could not get him to accept their rigid Calvinism, they left him, sworn enemies of his "novel" doctrine. From that time onwards the weight of persecution gradually increased in momentum, though it was about three years before it took shape in a formal prosecution for heresy in the Presbytery of Dumbarton.[7] Meantime, pamphlets had been written against him, tongues had wagged calumniously in corners, and many pul-

[7] This was the court of ordinary jurisdiction, exercising functions comparable to those of the bishop in episcopal systems.

pits had resounded with bitter denunciations of his "innovating" doctrine. All this he seems to have borne with a very commendable patience, as though he had fully expected it, even indeed as though he prognosticated his doom in the General Assembly. He did nothing rash, said nothing specially provocative, continuing only to expound quietly from his own pulpit and occasionally elsewhere the simple message that Christ died for all men. Such was his spiritual serenity that while the charges were being formulated against him in Presbytery he found time, in the midst of compiling careful answers which ran into one hundred and eighty-one pages, to write to his father, saying, in the most calm, matter-of-fact way, that the case had been "substantially decided" against him; that is, he expected deposition. He signed this note to his father, "abiding in the peace of God and the secret of the Lord's presence at Dumbarton at the Presbytery bar." Many years later Principal Shairp confessed to having shared with Norman Macleod, a Scottish divine who himself narrowly escaped prosecution for heresy, the strange feeling that when one talked alone with Campbell there was "a Third Being" present.[8]

What were the sources of Campbell's doctrine which was thought to be incompatible with the Westminster Confession? It is evident that many of those who supported the case against him feared that chief among them was a curious book which had been printed at Edinburgh in 1718, entitled The Marrow of Modern Divinity. This publication had so displeased the divines of the Assembly of 1720 that, after hearing the Report of their "Committee for Preserving Purity of Doctrine," they had not only forbidden all ministers to say or write anything in favor of it but had also "enjoined and required" them to "warn and exhort their people" not to read or use it. The book which had thus been indexed by the Kirk so soon after the Revolution Settlement was an antinomian thesis commending the view that everyone who believes that Christ is his, has Christ, and is therefore assured of salvation irrespective of the nature of his life. Naturally, it had made much of Biblical texts which most plainly favored a doctrine of universal atonement and pardon. Campbell undoubtedly knew this treatise, and emphatically dissociated himself, at

[8] Op. cit., vol. ii, p. 345.

his trial, from the antinomianism which it taught. His teaching, he affirmed, was not that of the Marrow. But his adversaries were disposed to treat the century-old ban on the Marrow not merely as a judgment of the Kirk against antinomianism but as an ecclesiastical law forbidding the teaching of anything contained in that book. They held that, since the book taught *inter alia* a doctrine of universal Atonement, all doctrines of universal Atonement were illegal in the Kirk. Yet their successors have sometimes sought to mitigate the Kirk's guilt in the Row case by contending that Campbell was the victim of her excessively logical temper.

Campbell's sources were, however, for the most part far removed from eighteenth century Scottish theology. It seems plain that he was very much better read in the Fathers of the early Church than were the vast majority of his judges. But he was also better informed than many of them about the original sources of Reformation theology. He knew that he had behind him authorities as ancient as Clement and Cyprian, and apart from his first-hand knowledge of Augustine's works he seems to have been influenced by the ecclesiastical historian Milner who, in inquiring "whether Augustine held 'particular redemption,'" pointed out that though in controversy Augustine was sometimes objected to as denying that Christ died for all men, Prosper, "as strict a predestinarian as any writer in any age," claimed that Augustine, whom he profoundly admired, held that Christ gave himself a ransom for all. Milner concluded: "the notion of particular redemption was unknown to the ancients, and I wish it had remained equally unknown to the moderns." [9] In Luther, Campbell had also detected support for his interpretation of Scripture; nor was he ignorant of Latimer's utterance in the Sermon on the Christian Walk: "For Christ shed as much blood for Judas as he did for Peter: Peter believed it, and therefore he was saved; Judas would not believe, and therefore he was condemned; the fault being in him only — in nobody else." In Becon, Jewel, and other English divines, Campbell had found not only support but no doubt also abundant patristic references unknown to most of his judges, who, moreover, cared little about them, taking the stand that neither Campbell nor anyone else had the right to interpret the West-

[9] Milner's Church History, vol. ii, p. 466 f.

minster Confession: the question was, they maintained, quite simple, namely, what did the Confession say? "I do not think there was ever a simpler proposition submitted to this Assembly," said one speaker, moving that the Assembly uphold the sentences of the lower courts and find the charge relevant. And another speaker, Dr. Fleming of Old Kilpatrick, in a most eloquently unconvincing outburst, asked the Assembly to take into account, as a reason for reaching a quick decision, his pain and that of his co-Presbyters at popular murmurings, engendered by the discharge of what they felt to be their duty, that they were more interested in the persecution of Campbell than in the duties of their parishes. He had never, he said, had any personal feelings towards the accused but those of good-will and kindness, but how could they bear "the painful spectacle, of a people asking for the bread of life, and having these serpent doctrines cast among them, to sting and kill them"? He ended by imploring the Assembly to "show mercy to the country" by "some prompt and vigorous measure" against the unrepentant perpetrator of the outrage.

But Campbell had not neglected the study of Calvin himself, and seems to have been familiar with Edward Williams's Essay on the Divine Government and the Sovereignty of Divine Grace, which notes that Calvin was only about twenty-seven when he wrote the Institutes, and that in his will, composed at the age of fifty-four, just before his death, he wrote:

"Testor etiam ac profiteor me suppliciter ab eo petere, ut ita me ablutum et mundatum velit sanguine summi redemptoris *effuso pro humani generis peccatis* ut mihi liceat apud tribunal ipsius consistere sub ipsius redemptoris imagine." [10]

He seems also to have known that John Owen, the author of Salus Electorum Sanguis Jesu, which he wrote at the age of about thirty-two, warmly recommended, at a more advanced period of his life, Polhill's treatise On the Divine Will. This book, to which Owen wrote a commendatory preface, says:

"Whosoever will may take the water of life. . . . Surely the Gospel knows no water of life but which Christ purchased, nor way of salva-

[10] The writer, not Calvin, italicizes.

tion but by a λύτρον — a price paid. If Christ no way died for all men, how can these promises stand true?"

Calvin's Scriptural Commentaries, which Campbell is likely to have known, have many passages plainly affirming a doctrine of universal Atonement, even though the French Reformer may have considered this not inconsistent with his predestinarian notions.[11] That Campbell's knowledge of the early Fathers should have been lost on the Kirk does not surprise us, knowing the theological limitations of his accusers; but it is very much to be questioned whether they had any but a perfunctory acquaintance with even Calvin himself, for all the fanatical zeal with which they professed him as their theological allegiance. (I am always glad to hear of Calvinists who take to reading Calvin.) In fact, of course, the Kirk was dominated less by any theological belief than by a psychological fear, namely, that were she to be open to the charge of having modified her Standard, her *raison d'être* would become difficult to explain. So much had she identified herself with the Westminster Confession that she could think of hardly any other theologically defensible reason to justify her political Establishment. The fact that after the Disruption of 1843 it was the Free Church rather than the Established which came to be associated with the most rigid Calvinistic orthodoxy suggests that many of Campbell's contemporaries must have cared little one way or the other for doctrinal points. And such was the case: the Moderates, whose attitude precipitated the Disruption, were, in general, theologically latitudinarian. Yet they, no less than the Evangelicals, but for other reasons, upheld legalistic adherence to the Confession; they feared that laxity in this matter would undermine the "influence of the Kirk."

Throughout all the formal proceedings against him, Campbell contended that what he had taught and proposed to go on teaching was not inconsistent with the Westminster Confession, the Kirk's official standard of interpretation of Holy Writ. The Confession

[11] E.g., on Matt. xxvi, 28: "Sub multorum nomine non partem mundi tantum designat, sed totum humanum genus." And on Rom. v, 18: "Communem omnium gratiam facit, quia omnibus exposita est, non quod ad omnes extendatur re ipsa. Nam etsi passus est Christus pro peccatis totius mundi atque omnibus indifferenter, Dei benignitate offeretur: non tamen omnes apprehendunt."

was drawn up, he maintained, under the authority of a Commission which recognized the English Thirty-nine Articles as the basis of the Westminster Assembly's deliberations. Had the Westminster divines intended to set forth a doctrine of limited Atonement they would have been acting against the commission given to them; but in any case they did not set this forth. Moreover, Campbell noted, all the great Christian statements of doctrine recognize a universal Atonement except the Westminster Confession which however, though it does not affirm such a doctrine, does not deny it; it does not "set forth any lie." Perhaps it ought to have stated the truth explicitly, having regard to the plain testimony of Scripture, the Fathers, and the early Creeds; yet the Kirk had fallen away from her own standards as well as those of all Christendom, developing an error peculiar to herself and without scriptural authority. Such were the lines of Campbell's defence, and questionable as might be some of his contentions, his argument was on the whole a very reasonable one.

The General Assembly sat throughout the whole night till six o'clock the following morning. The prosecution's speeches were dreary and long even for those leisured days, being heavily laden with Calvinistic technicalities; the published Report runs into two hundred closely printed pages.[12] Old family friends trounced the accused for perverting the Kirk's established doctrine with his dangerous opinions. Yet in recalling the scene more than thirty years afterwards,[13] he remarks that that which had pained him more than had anything else was to hear one of his judges ("a D.D.," he sorrowfully observes) say: "He cannot preach this and be a minister of the Church of Scotland. Let him go to England and preach it, and we may bid him God speed." That anyone should suppose a doctrine to be true south of the Scottish Border yet false north of it horrified Campbell, whose purity of heart and integrity of mind unfitted him to detect the extent of the intellectual depravity around him. With touching simplicity he notes that the question should have been: "What is the truth of God here?"

[12] A Full Report of the Proceedings in the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, in the case of the Rev. John M'Leod Campbell, late Minister of Row, published by Lusk, Greenock, 1831. The proceedings in the inferior courts, no less tedious, have also been published.

[13] Letter to D. J. Vaughan, November 13th, 1862 (Memorials, vol. ii, p. 35).

Unfrocked, he set himself the task of immediately returning to Row to arrange some affairs concerning the Poor Fund of the parish. Then on a warm Sunday evening in July he preached to a vast congregation in the open-air. Many who could not join the crowd listened from windows to a sermon which had no bitterness but only the familiar message of God's love to all mankind. Then, having bidden farewell to the parish he tenderly loved, he spent some weeks preaching on hillsides and elsewhere in various parts of the Scottish Highlands. Wherever he went he found many who deplored the condition of the Kirk which had cast out of her ministry a man of such spiritual integrity and zeal. Many of those Bible-reading peasants must have wrinkled their weather-beaten brows in trying to understand how Campbell's teaching that the Fatherhood of God was universal could be so heinous a heresy as to merit deposition. The General Assembly had said, however, that it was contrary to Scripture.

At the time of Campbell's trial the Kirk had recently been on the scent of another heretic, Edward Irving, the founder of the "Catholic Apostolic Church." Irving had already, in the preceding year, been excommunicated by his own Presbytery;[14] but he was not formally deposed till 1833, the year before his early death. Irving was about eight years older than Campbell, and three years before his ordination he acted as "licensed assistant" to the subsequently famous Thomas Chalmers in St. John's, Glasgow. Because his preaching did not accord with the traditional pattern, he was unpopular, it seems, among the congregation there, except among the poor. Chalmers, with evident sarcasm, compared his assistant's preaching to "Italian music, appreciated only by connoisseurs." What the young Irving was chiefly groping for was the beauty which the Kirk had stubbornly excluded from its worship; but his immediate reaction to the Kirk took the form of an attack on its legalism and doctrinal aridity. Much less theologically minded and skilled than Campbell, he tried a sort of revival of the apostolic "speaking with tongues." But he was fumbling for something which, as we shall presently see, followed in Campbell's

[14] The Presbytery of London, one of the Kirk's presbyteries "furth of Scotland." The sentence of excommunication was evidently ineffective for certain technical reasons. In 1833 sentence of deposition was passed by the Presbytery of Annan.

wake and was due to the latter's theological influence more than to any other circumstance.

After Campbell's deposition, some friends and supporters built him a little independent chapel in Blackfriars Street, Glasgow, in which he ministered till his health broke down, causing him to give up regular preaching. It was typical of him, as it was not of Irving, that he never discouraged people to give their allegiance to the Kirk so long as they found spiritual satisfaction there; and when he left his chapel he advised his loyal congregation to return to the fold which had cast him out. During the years that followed he travelled, read, and talked with many divines; these included Charles Kingsley, F. D. Maurice, and the future Cardinal Manning. In 1854 he wrote The Nature of the Atonement, a thesis in defense of the position to which he had adhered at a less mature age. This was followed by Christ the Bread of Life and other works.

But during these years, the Kirk, overtaken by the tide of public opinion had sought gradually to shift her ground. By the sixties she was to be found not only modifying her theological position, but actually teaching her candidates for the ministry, in the theological halls, the doctrine that had cost Campbell deposition; and indeed, during his lifetime as a deposed minister, his book on the Atonement was being inconspicuously used in these halls. This is perhaps not very much more curious, however, than the fact that, before the end of the nineteenth century, Scottish divines had widely accepted the principles of Biblical exegesis for inculcating which Robertson Smith had been deprived of his Free Church chair in 1881. But a more personal token of contrition was about to be made by the Kirk. During Campbell's ministry at Row one of his friends had observed sadly: "They won't make a D.D. of Campbell." [15] Now, in 1868, the University of Glasgow, led by John Caird, bestowed its D.D., *honoris causa*, on the "Row heretic" who was still under the Kirk's sentence of deposition. Then in 1871, the year before his death, distinguished representatives of all the principal denominations in Scotland, including the Established Kirk, paid formal tribute to the deepening of

[15] Memorials, vol. ii, p. 208.

religious thought and life in Scotland which Campbell had effected without ever forgetting the "meekness and gentleness of Christ." And Campbell, as ever charitable and simple-hearted, saw in these manifestations only the triumph of truth over error, and was greatly delighted by them.

He reminds one in many ways, not least in his tender unworldliness, of George Herbert. In a charming essay on the country parson of Caroline England, Mr. A. L. Rowse reflects on the Rector of Bemerton's "love of music . . . of flowers and birds and church bells, of the old country customs and the country people." It was such things that delighted Campbell. One can see his heart, too, in his advice to his eldest son, the year before the latter was ordained deacon in the Church of England: referring to the question of Biblical criticism, interest in which was being aroused at that time, he recommended his son to let such criticism stimulate his mind without too lightly carrying off his heart. Then he adds, recalling how he had loved the beauty of the Cambridge Backs:[16]

"I am glad that my John sees them as I saw them. . . . But I go back to other elements at Cambridge . . . with most interest to *our* receiving the bread and wine *together* at St. Mary's." [17]

Then, a few hours after the ordination, he writes:[18]

"I read the Ordination Service to your mother after breakfast to help her realization of it. . . . I seem to myself to be in these days realizing what it is to enter on the ministry more than I did even when receiving ordination myself. . . . I do not forget that there is an important addition to 'take heed unto thyself,' in the words 'and to thy doctrine';[19] but I am persuaded if all that is implied in taking due heed unto oneself were more realized, the addition would be seen to be less in proportion than it usually seems."

Campbell saw more clearly now that which the Kirk's perverted theology had so horribly obscured, namely, that moral and other human values can be dissociated from religion only at our peril. Perhaps he saw also that dissatisfaction with the Kirk's attitude on this had been at the root of his own protest in 1831.

[16] Letter, May 21st, 1865; op. cit., p. 91.
[17] Campbell's italics.
[18] Letter, June 11th, 1865; op. cit.
[19] 1 Timothy 4.16.

On Monday, February 19th, 1872, Campbell wrote to his son Donald referring to "a good sermon by Robert yesterday from the words: 'I thank thee that thou hast hid those things from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes.'" That afternoon he visited an old friend who was dying and prayed with her. On the way back with his wife he stopped in the garden to help to plant some roses. On Wednesday he took ill, and during the rest of the week he kept repeating to himself passages from devotional works. Early on the following Tuesday he died at Achnashie ("the field of peace"), in the house which a thoughtful friend had bought for him, looking across the Gareloch to the scene of his brief ministry in Row.

It has been said that what is remarkable about the influence of the Tractarians in England is much less that they fostered the development of a vivacious and determined party within Anglicanism than that they touched and moulded the thought of those Anglicans who remained least in sympathy with them, and even, indeed, that of many people outside the Church of England who had scarcely heard of them. But in a way Campbell's influence is from such a standpoint even more striking. For he fostered no party; nor has any party arisen which can be said to have looked to his thought as its chief inspiration; yet his influence has pervaded both Scotland and England in such a way that were he to be forgotten there is much in the development of religious thought in Britain in the second half of the nineteenth century that would be hard to explain.

Even the theology that is in its day most lively is often arid to the next generation. When we read, for example, in one of the most stimulating, not to say epoch-making, books of its day, Lux Mundi, that "the death of Christ was not the cause, but the revelation of that love [the love of God]," [20] we are inclined to take this for a sort of pious truism. But at the time (1890) it was still a point worth making. And it is noteworthy that in making it the author of the essay adds a footnote referring to a passage in The Nature of the Atonement and saying: "This is well stated

[20] Lux Mundi, a series of studies edited by Charles Gore; vii, The Atonement, by the Rev. and Hon. Arthur Lyttelton; (12th edit., New York, Thomas Whittaker) p. 256.

by McLeod Campbell." The notion of love in religion was not one which had dominated British theology in the eighteenth and earlier part of the nineteenth centuries. In Scotland it had, practically speaking, vanished altogether, and even in England it had become a somewhat abstract conception not conspicuously associated with the doctrine of the Incarnation. It was an incarnational theology that Gore and his friends sought to rediscover. Writing three years before the appearance of Hort's Hulsean Lectures and eight years before the founding of the Modern Churchmen's Union, the authors of Lux Mundi, describing themselves in the preface to the original edition as seeking "to put the Catholic faith into its right relation to modern intellectual and moral problems" rather than to become mere innovators, had still to cope with a force which had obscured a central Christian notion. But it was a notion that was by then very much less obscure than it had been to the preceding generation.

In Scotland, the immense change of attitude about the love of God may be seen in the succession of Declaratory Acts [21] passed from 1879 onwards and designed to allow belief, in spite of anything that might be suggested to the contrary by the Westminster Confession, in the possibility of God's grace extending as far as beyond Christendom, and to make it no longer necessary for Scottish Presbyterians to believe in the damnation of the non-elect who die as infants. The Act of 1879, for example, announced, seven years after Campbell's death: "It is not required to be held that . . . God may not extend His grace to any who are without the pale of ordinary means, as it may seem good in His sight." [22] It is, of course, permitted to Scottish Presbyterians, as it is not to Catholics, to believe in a restricted Fatherhood of God, and many today profess to do so; but the general temper of the Kirk has much though slowly changed since Campbell's trial for heresy in 1831. There is little apart from him to account for the change having been initiated, for ever since 1690 Scottish Presbyterianism

[21] Sc., that of the United Presbyterian Synod in 1879, that of the Free Church of Scotland in 1892, and that of the Established Church of Scotland in 1910. The latter was intended to facilitate the Union of Scottish Presbyterians which took place in 1929.

[22] Section 4 of the Act of 1879.

has been notoriously hostile, on the whole, towards all external, and particularly Anglican, influence.

Campbell's thought has also left its imprint, in a less direct but very interesting fashion, on a curious movement within the Kirk, traceable to a date as far back as the beginning of the eighteenth century, to modify the baldness and aridity of its worship. Campbell was not associated specially with any such movement; but he precipitated its development, the later stages of which plainly show his influence. The notorious antipathy of the Kirk to beauty has not been just the old Puritan suspicion of art, though it was this too. But having made out of churches devoid of every vestige of beauty a virtue of necessity, and having in the eighteenth century thriven in such an atmosphere, she was quick to take advantage of the bankruptcy of taste, which she had herself fostered among her people, to spend as little as possible of her patrimony on art.[23] Dilapidated churches were repaired cheaply and vulgarly; every popular diatribe against art (notably against choral and instrumental music) was eagerly encouraged. That all this went beyond the ordinary Puritan predilection for simplicity may be seen from the fact that it was not thought in the least incongruous that the private houses of those who inveighed so brutally against art in the sanctuary were sometimes furnished in a most costly and elegant style. A rare silver or ivory Buddha from the Orient might well adorn the private room of a champion of austerity in the church. Indeed, an ambiguity in the word "austere" led many to identify such an attitude towards religion with saintliness: the Scottish Calvinist saint was an "austere man," and if he did not express his moral austerity in worship, the sincerity of his moral profession would have been in question. Campbell helped Scottish Presbyterians to doubt whether this, their traditional ideal of saintliness was a Christian one.

The first hint of uneasiness about Scottish Presbyterian worship

[23] A characteristic tract, dated 1738 and entitled An Essay upon the Sacred Use of Organs, openly proclaims this attitude, saying (p. 4) that the people of Scotland "seem never to have much admired such pompous, gauding Braveries in the Worship of God, as the musical Whistlings of a Pair of Organs" and that they "for the generality, have something else to do with what little Moyety their barren Clime can afford 'em, than to lavish it out upon an expensive Organ, and a Choir of chanting Quiristers."

is to be found in an anonymous book published in 1802 at Inverness, entitled, The Scotch Minister's Assistant. It was a book of forms compiled with a view to mitigating the tedium of the extempore prayers, the usual length of which may be imagined from the fact that in this book the prayers proposed for use before and after sermon run into nine or ten pages each. In 1812 a feeble attempt to introduce an organ into St Andrew's Church, Glasgow, resulted in vehement opposition including official protest from the Town Council. By 1857 it was possible for Dr. Robert Lee of Old Greyfriars', Edinburgh, to begin a systematic crusade for reform in such matters, and by 1865 he had introduced a prayer-book and an organ into his church. It is true that he did not do this with impunity, for only illness and death prevented him from seeing the culmination of his persecutors' efforts in a case pending against him in the General Assembly. Nevertheless, by 1865 public opinion had become sufficiently modified to permit the founding of the Church Service Society, an association pledged to foster such ideals. No doubt it was a paltry venture which one would find it hard to take very seriously today, though it was thought daring at the time. One minister even wrote a pamphlet to show how the ideas of the somewhat narrow-minded little Scottish society were linked with contemporary French atheism, and in 1866 a prominent Edinburgh clergyman refused to allow the formerly much respected Dr. A. K. H. Boyd into his pulpit because of the latter's association with the Church Service Society. Its interest for us lies rather in its symbolizing the results of a change of spirit which, though as yet hardly articulate in the Kirk at large, had been effected by Campbell. Doubt had entered the Scottish Presbyterian mind: might it not be that the love of God was a little wider than the abstract concept the Kirk had made of it? might it by chance extend even beyond the Kirk herself? The political and industrial development of Britain in the nineteenth century had brought Scotland nearer to England; it was no longer possible to ignore the broader notions of English theology or carry on the legend that being a good Calvinist made one theologically a Good European. The better educated laymen were widely beginning to appreciate the truth in the dictum of a late eighteenth-century historian of Edinburgh that "Scotland, being freed from the

shackles of papal usurpation was well nigh subjected to a more formidable tyrant in the person of her deliverer." [24] But the Kirk's leaders found it more expedient to turn as quietly and gracefully as they could towards the newer attitude than to stress the unpalatable fact that within living memory John McLeod Campbell had been deposed for openly confessing that Christ died for all men, not only for the "Kirk of God." Rigid Calvinism had been on the whole but the theological cloak of the politically minded leaders of the Kirk of Campbell's day, and it is more than doubtful whether any theological influence could have affected the hearts or minds of their successors who were so shrewdly concerned that his memory should not live in the popular imagination.[25] His influence therefore touched many who did not always fully recognize whence their inspiration was derived.

Perhaps more remarkable still was the founding of another association, formed in 1892, the Scottish Church Society. Ostensibly founded to recall the Kirk to a past heritage and to oppose innovations which were said to be creeping into her doctrine and worship, this society adopted as its strikingly conservative motto the text: "Ask for the old paths . . . and walk therein." [26] Scrutiny of its constitution quickly reveals, however, that the "old paths" are the early Catholic creeds, notably the doctrines from which, in restricting the Fatherhood of God, the Westminster Confession departs. Hence we have, sixty years after the Row Heresy trial,

[24] Hugo Arnot, History of Edinburgh (Edinburgh, Creech, 1788), p. 35.

[25] The Row case was unsuccessfully recalled by a speaker at the Assembly of 1897, when the young incumbent of the parish of Kilmun, not far from Row, was charged with heresy. This heretic, Alexander Robinson, had written a somewhat immature book in which he seemed to deny the divinity of Christ and to repudiate belief in miracles. At that Assembly there happened to be another disciplinary case under consideration, in which the accused was charged with misconduct, including gross drunkenness. The leader of the house, Dr. Archibald Scott, said that it was a painful duty to bring forward this latter case, in which he begged the Assembly to show leniency in their judgment of a brother minister. When the Kilmun case was considered, however, Dr. Scott explained at once that here he had no compunction: it was a question of doctrine. Even despite the recommendation of leniency by W. P. Paterson, then of Aberdeen University and later Dean of Divinity at Edinburgh, Robinson was deposed after 308 votes had been recorded in favor of this sentence and but 134 against it. It should be remembered that the alternative proposed by those against deposition involved severe censure and the injunction to future care and reverence in questions of faith.

[26] Jer. vi, 16.

the institution of a conspicuously "traditionalist" society of ecclesiastics who were presently to win much notoriety on that account within the Kirk, and who were traditionalist largely by reason of their emphasis on the theological attitude for which the Row heretic was deposed.

BOOKS RECEIVED

L'Annee du Seigneur. *Par D. Aemiliana Loerr.* Bruges, Beyaert, [1946]. 2 volumes. frs. b. 235.

L'Apocalypse. *Traduit par le R.P. Boismard.* Paris. Du Cerf, 1950. 88 p.

Aspects of the Principate of Tiberius. *By Michael Grant.* N. Y., American Numismatic Society, 1950. 199 p. viii plates. $5.00.

Aux Sources de la Tradition Chretienne. Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire. Paris, De Lachaux et Niestlé, [1950]. 280 p. 12 fr.

Bekentnisse. *By Aurelius Augustinus.* Zürich, Artemis-Verlag, [1950]. 467 p.

Die Christliche Lehre von Schöpfung und Erlösung. (Dogmatik, Band II). *Von Emil Brunner.* Zürich, Zwingli, [1950]. 455 p. Fr. 12.50.

The Dartmouth Bible. Boston, Houghton, 1950. xxxviii, 1257 p. $7.50.

De Ecclesiae Infallibilitate in Canonizatione Sanctorum. *By P. Franciscus Spedalieri.* Rome, Catholic Book Agency, 1949. 63 p.

De Reformatione Liturgica Heraclii Lisowskyj. *By M. M. Solowij.* Rome, Sumptibus P. P. Basilianorum, 1950. xi, 128 p. $2.00.

Le Deuteronome. *Traduit par H. Cazelles.* Paris, Du Cerf, 1950. 140 p.

Early Christian Creeds. *By J. N. D. Kelly.* N. Y., Longmans, 1950. xi, 446 p. $5.75.

The English Reformation to 1558. *By T. M. Parker.* London, Oxford University Press, 1950. 200 p. $2.00.

L'Evangile Selon Saint Matthieu. (La Sainte Bible). Paris, Du Cerf, 1950. 171 p.

Erasmus and the Spanish Inquisition. *By John E. Longhurst.* Albuquerque, University of New Mexico Press, 1950. 114 p. $1.00.

Five Minutes to Twelve. *By W. E. Purcell.* N. Y., Morehouse-Gorham, 1950. 104 p. $2.00.

Five Sermons Preached at the Rolls Chapel and A Dissertation Upon the Nature of Virtue. *By Joseph Butler.* N. Y., The Liberal Arts Press, 1950. 90 p. $.50.

Great Visions of Philosophy. *By William Pepperell Montague.* La Salle, Illinois, Open Court Publishing Company, 1950. 484 p. $4.50.

Herrnhutisk Teologi I Svensk Gestalt. . . *Av Gösta Hök.* Uppsala, Lundequistska, 1949. 27 p.

The Historic Faith and The Changing World. *By W. Norman Pittenger.* N. Y., Oxford University Press, 1950. 181 p. $2.50.

In the Beginning. *By Solomon Goldman.* N. Y., Harper, [1949]. 206 p.

Indices Pseudo-Dionysiani. . *A Alb. Van Den Daele.* Louvain, Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1941. 154 p.

Influence de L'Evangile de Saint Matthieu sur la Litterature Chretienne avant Saint Irenee. *Par Edouard Massaux.* Louvain, Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1950. xlviii, 730 p. 550 fr.

Initium Omnis Peccati Superbia. *By William M. Green.* Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1949. 24 p.

Isaaks Opferung Christlich Gedeutet. *Von David Lerch.* Tübingen, Mohr, 1950. 290 p. 6 M.

Jesus — God, Man or Myth? *By Herbert Cutner.* N. Y. Truth Seeker Company, [1950]. 298 p. $2.50.

John Calvin on God and Political Duty. *Edited by John T. McNeill.* N. Y., Oxford University Press, 1950. 102 p. $2.50.

La Joie Dans Saint Paul. *Par Jacques le Mineur.* Paris, Lethielleux, 1950. 30 p.

Les Justes et la Justice dans les Evangiles et le Christianisme Primitif Hormis La Doctrine Proprement Paulinienne. *Par Albert Descamps.* Louvain, Publications Universitaires de Louvain, 1950. 335 p. 260 frs.

Die Kabiren. *Von Bengt Hemberg.* Uppsala, Almquits & Wiksells, 1950. 420 p. 25 Swedish crowns.

Le Livre de Josue. *Traduit par F.-M. Abel.* Paris, Du Cerf, 1950. 88 p.

Le Livre de la Sagesse. (La Sainte Bible). Paris, Du Cerf, 1950.

La Mantique Apollinienne A Delphes. *Par Pierre Amandry.* Paris, E. de Boccard, 1950. 290 p.

Das Menschenbild Im Lichte des Evangeliums. Festschrift zum 60 Geburtstag. . . Emil Brunner. Zürich, Zwingli, 1950. 185 p. $8.50.

L'Oraison A L'Ecole de la Venerable Madeleine de Saint Joseph Carmelite Dechaussee, 1578–1637. Paris, 1950. 32 p.

Les Origines du Monde et de L'Humanite. *Par Paul Denis.* Liège, La Pensée Catholique, 1950. 179 p.

Philosophy and the Foundations of Belief in God. *By Olle Herrlin.* Lund, 1950. 202 p.

Platon. *Von Ernst Hoffman.* Zürich, Artemis-Verlag, [1950]. 222 p.

Probatio Charitatis. *By Hieronymus Mahieu.* Bruges, Beyaert, [1946]. 514 p. frs. b. 150.

Revelation and the Modern World. *By L. S. Thornton.* London, Dacre Press, 1950. 339 p. 30 s.

Roosevelt and the Will of God. *By Hugh Allen.* N. Y., Lifetime Editions, 1950. 280 p. $3.50.

Le Sacrifice du Corps Mystique. *Par Eugène Masure.* Paris, Desclée de Brouwer, [1950]. 206 p.

Selectae et Breviores. *By Franciscus Spedalieri.* Rome, Catholic Book Agency, 1949. 122 p.

The Servant Motif in the Old Testament. *By Curt Lindhagen.* Uppsala, Lundequistska, 1950. xv, 36 p.

The Transcendalists. *By Perry Miller.* Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1950. 521 p. $6.50.

Il Trionfo Dell'Ontologismo in Sicilia. *Per Salvatore Scimé.* Mazara, Società Editrice Siciliana, 1949. 265 p. L. 850.

The Truth That Frees. [*By Sam Evans Hayes*]. Seattle, Learn and Live, 1950. 67 p. $.25.

Les Valeurs et Leur Signification Theologique. *Par Gabriel-Ph. Widmer.* Paris, Delachaux et Niestlé, 1950. 177 p. 7.50 fr.

VERS L'ACTION AVEC SAINT AUGUSTINE. *Par F. Cayré.* Paris, Letheilleux, 1950. 226 p.

WHITEHEAD'S THEORY OF EXPERIENCE. *By Ewing P. Shahan.* N. Y. Columbia University Press, 1950. 140 p. $2.50.

ZUR TYPOLOGIE DES JOHANNES EVANGELIUMS. *Von Harald Sahlin.* Uppsala, Lundequistska, 1950. 78 p. 3:25